THE CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK OF PANCHAYATS IN INDIA: A CRITICAL STUDY OF STRUCTURE, POWERS AND GOVERNANCE UNDER PART IX OF THE CONSTITUTION

G.Anbuselvi
Student
SASTRA Deemed University

1.1 Historical genealogy of village self-government

The ideal of village self-government in India predates the modern nation-state and figures prominently in pre-colonial, colonial, and post-Independence political thought. Traditional village panchayats, while informal and caste-embued, were often seen as primary sites of dispute resolution and local order, embodying an ethos of community-based governance. Under colonial rule, the institution was gradually eroded or co-opted into administrative machinery, weakening its normative autonomy.

After Independence, the Constitution-makers included Article 40 in the Directive Principles of State Policy, declaring that the state "shall take steps to organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government." This provision, though non-justiciable, became the constitutional lodestar for subsequent reform. Early experiments—the Balwantrai Mehta Committee (1957), Ashok Mehta Committee (1977), and G.V.K. Rao Committee (1985)—recommended a progressively stronger panchayat system, with regular elections, financial autonomy, and planning authority at the village, block, and district levels.

These recommendations culminated in the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, which constitutionalised PRIs and sought to close the gap between constitutional promise and institutional practice. Legal scholarship now widely treats the Amendment as a "second generation" of Indian constitutionalism, one that explicitly seeks to democratize governance at the micro-level.

1.2 Constitutional structure of PRIs under Part IX

The 73rd Amendment inserted Part IX into the Constitution and added the Eleventh Schedule, thereby creating a common constitutional framework for Panchayati Raj across almost all states. Article 243B mandates a three-tier system: Gram Panchayat at the village level; Panchayat Samiti at the intermediate (block) level; and Zila Parishad at the district level. Where the population is very small, the Constitution permits states to prescribe a two-tier system.

Articles 243C–243H govern the composition, duration, elections, reservations, and disqualifications of members. PRIs are to be constituted through direct elections every five years, with independent State Election Commissions overseeing the process. Seats are reserved for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and women, in proportion to their population and, in the case of women, at least one-third of seats and chairpersons.

Financial provisions under Articles 243I–243O envisage:

- State Finance Commissions to recommend principles for devolution of funds;
- Constitution of district and state-level funds for PRIs;
- Measures for audit and financial accountability; and
- Powers of states to legislate on the organization, powers, and functions of panchayats.

The Eleventh Schedule, added by the 73rd Amendment, enumerates 29 subjects, including agriculture, minor irrigation, animal husbandry, fisheries, rural housing, drinking water, roads, poverty alleviation, and social welfare, assigning these to PRIs as part of their functional mandate.

1.3 Democratic decentralization: theory, typology, and constitutional intent

Democratic decentralization through PRIs is usually understood as a trilateral transfer of authority, resources, and responsibility from higher tiers of government to elected local bodies. Political scientists and legal scholars often distinguish three dimensions:

- **Political decentralization**: devolution of decision-making authority to elected local representatives, including the power to formulate priorities, approve plans and budgets, and exercise oversight over implementation.
- **Administrative decentralization**: transfer of functionaries, staff, and day-to-day management of local public services to PRIs, reducing dependence on state departments.
- **Fiscal decentralization**: allocation of functionally matched grants, local revenue-raising powers, and financial autonomy to ensure that PRIs can actually implement what they plan.

The constitutional intent of Part IX is to move from a centralized, hierarchical model of governance to a "nested" or multi-tiered system where local bodies are not mere implementing agencies but "institutions of self-government." Judicial pronouncements have repeatedly stressed that the 73rd Amendment seeks to institutionalize local self-rule and that states must not treat PRIs as subordinate to departments.

Yet, legal-institutional practice often falls short of this ideal. Many states devolve only a narrow set of functions, retain control over key departments, and under-fund PRIs, thereby converting constitutional decentralization into a largely "formal" exercise.

1.4 Local participation and the role of Gram Sabha

The Gram Sabha, defined as the assembly of all adult residents of a village Panchayat, is the constitutional bedrock of participatory democracy in PRIs. Articles 243A and 243G envisage the Gram Sabha as the primary site for deliberation, plan-approval, and social oversight, including the scrutiny of beneficiary lists, works, and accounts.

However, in many states Gram Sabha meetings are irregular, poorly convened, or ritualistic, with genuine deliberation undermined by bureaucratic control and social hierarchies. Legal design often leaves the frequency and modalities of Gram Sabha functioning to state laws, resulting in variation and, in some cases, conscious dilution of its powers.

Scholarly work highlights two divergent visions of local participation:

- A **community-centred** model that emphasizes deliberative democracy, consensus, and collective decision-making; and
- A **statist-centred** model that treats participation as consultation or information-gathering for state programmes.

The constitutional design of PRIs leans toward the former, but implementation often slides toward the latter, especially in welfare-scheme-driven governance.

1.5 Inclusive governance: reservations, representation, and social realities

Inclusion is a core constitutional commitment of the PRI system, operationalised through statutory reservations for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and women. Article 243D mandates reservation of seats for SCs and STs in proportion to their population and provides for rotation of reserved seats after each delimitation. Article 243T similarly requires reservation of not less than one-third of seats (and chairpersons) for women, with many states enhancing this to 50 percent.

Legal-sociological studies show that these reservations have significantly increased the numerical presence of women and marginalized groups in rural governance. However, mere descriptive representation does not automatically translate into substantive influence. The phenomenon of "proxy" or "zombie" leaders—where male relatives or local elites effectively control women or lower-caste representatives—remains a serious challenge.

Judicial and policy discourse now increasingly emphasizes the need for supportive infrastructure:

- Capacity-building in leadership, financial management, and technical skills;
- Protection against social and political intimidation; and
- Institutional mechanisms (such as grievance bodies and gender-sensitive guidelines) to ensure that reservations translate into real power.

1.6 Functional mandate and convergence with national schemes

PRIs are expected to function as both local self-governing bodies and primary agencies for implementing national and state development programmes. Their functional mandate under the Eleventh Schedule spans:

- Agriculture and allied activities;
- Minor irrigation and watershed development;
- Animal husbandry, dairy, and fisheries;
- Rural housing and drinking water;
- Roads, bridges, and rural electrification (to a limited extent);
- Poverty alleviation, self-employment, and micro-enterprises;
- Education, health, and social welfare.

In practice, PRIs have become central to flagship schemes such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA), Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Gramin, Swachh Bharat Mission–Grameen, and various social-assistance programmes. By localizing planning and implementation, PRIs can improve targeting, reduce leakages, and enhance responsiveness.

At the same time, this role exposes PRIs to competing pressures:

- Top-down administrative control to ensure compliance with central guidelines;
- Political interference in beneficiary selection; and
- Weak local capacity in planning, monitoring, and financial management.

Legal-institutional reforms are increasingly directed at strengthening PRI capacity and ensuring that convergence with national schemes does not erode, but rather entrenches, local autonomy.

1.7 Territorial and legal diversity across states

The constitutional architecture of PRIs is uniform, but their operational reality is shaped by state-specific Panchayati Raj Acts, local customs, and historical trajectories. States differ along several dimensions:

- The number and composition of tiers (some states add ward or intermediate bodies);
- The extent of functional devolution (some states decentralize land-use planning and minor irrigation, others retain them with departments);
- The design of reservation and nomination systems;
- The strength and independence of State Election Commissions and Finance Commissions; and
- The mechanisms for social audit and grievance redressal
- Legal-empirical studies show that states such as Kerala, Karnataka, and some north-eastern states have achieved relatively higher levels of devolution and participation, while others remain heavily centralized. This interstate variation poses a central question for legal research: how to reconcile the constitutional uniformity of Part IX with the constitutional-federal diversity of state-level governance.

1.8 Panchayats in Scheduled and tribal areas: PESA and customary law

In Scheduled Areas, the normative logic of decentralization takes a distinct shape through the Panchayats (Extension to the Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA). PESA extends Part IX to these areas in a modified form, explicitly recognizing the role of customary institutions and collective decision-making by tribal communities.

Under PESA, Gram Sabhas or traditional bodies are endowed with authority over:

- Land and its transfer;
- Minor forest produce;
- Minor water bodies;
- Social forestry and local resources.

Legally, PESA seeks to harmonize constitutional decentralization with tribal self-determination and customary law, but implementation remains uneven. Bureaucratic resistance, weak capacity, and the overlap with central and state forest and revenue laws often dilute PESA's transformative potential. This raises delicate questions of legal pluralism and the place of customary law within the constitutional-statutory framework.

1.9 Judicial interpretation: autonomy, devolution, and accountability

The Supreme Court and various High Courts have played a crucial role in interpreting the scope of PRI autonomy under Part IX. A recurring theme in jurisprudence is the insistence that PRIs are "institutions of self-government" and not mere executive agencies of the state. Courts have repeatedly directed states to meaningfully devolve functions, funds, and functionaries, rather than treating PRIs as subordinate to departments.

Judicial pronouncements have also clarified issues of:

- The independence and integrity of State Election Commissions;
- The legality of state interference in PRI decisions; and
- The viability and enforceability of reservations and social-audit mechanisms.

However, the enforcement gap remains pronounced. While the judiciary articulates strong constitutional visions of decentralization, effective implementation often depends on political will, administrative capacity, and civil-society mobilization.

1.10 Challenges and contradictions in PRI functioning

Despite constitutional entrenchment and statutory design, PRIs face a range of structural and contextual challenges. These include:

- **Inadequate devolution**: many states devolve only "easy" functions, retaining control over key domains such as land, irrigation, and major infrastructure.
- **Weak fiscal autonomy**: PRIs often remain dependent on central and state transfers, with limited locally-raised revenue and constrained borrowing powers.
- **Administrative over-control**: departments frequently retain veto powers, undermining PRI authority.
- **Social and political exclusion**: caste, class, and gender hierarchies can reproduce informal power structures even within formally inclusive institutions.
- **Capacity deficits**: many PRI members lack training in planning, finance, technical management, and legal compliance.

These challenges reveal a central tension: the constitutional aspiration for local self-government versus the practical realities of state-centric governance and bureaucratic inertia.

1.11 Legal-research questions and thematic trajectory of the article

Against this dense constitutional-institutional background, the present legal research article seeks to address several interrelated questions:

- How does the constitutional-textual framework of Articles 40, 243–243O, and the Eleventh Schedule interact with state-level Panchayati Raj Acts and judicial interpretation?
- What is the nature and extent of "effective" devolution of functions, funds, and functionaries in selected states, and how is this gap reflected in case-law?
- How do reservations and Gram Sabha mechanisms operate in practice, and to what extent do they further inclusive governance or remain largely symbolic?
- What role do PRIs play in the implementation of national welfare schemes, and how can law-reform strengthen their autonomy while ensuring accountability?
- How does PESA reshape the constitutional-federal and legal-pluralist architecture of decentralization in Scheduled Areas?

The article will proceed through a layered analysis: first, a doctrinal-constitutional reading of Part IX and allied provisions; second, a comparative-statutory analysis of select state Panchayati Raj laws; third, a jurisprudential review of key Supreme Court and High Court judgments; and fourth, an assessment of selected empirical studies to bridge the gap between constitutional text and ground-level reality.

By weaving together constitutional doctrine, statutory design, judicial interpretation, and empirical evidence, this chapter aims to lay a robust foundation for a legally-rigorous, contextually grounded, and policy-oriented inquiry into Panchayati Raj Institutions as the constitutional architecture of local self-government in rural India.

Chapter 2 – Historical Evolution

The present-day Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) did not emerge in a constitutional vacuum; rather, they are the product of a long historical trajectory stretching from ancient village councils to colonial-era administrative reforms and post-Independence institutional experimentation. This chapter traces that evolution, showing how successive phases—pre-colonial, colonial, and post-colonial—gradually shaped the normative and structural foundations of local self-government in rural India.

2.1 Pre-colonial and early village governance

In ancient and early-modern India, self-governance at the village level was often exercised through informal councils or assemblies, commonly known as *panchayats*. These councils were typically composed of elders or heads of prominent families and were entrusted with settling local disputes, managing common resources, and maintaining social order. Village governance was thus deeply rooted in customary norms and community-based authority, even though participation was often restricted by caste and gender hierarchies.

While not a uniform national system, the pattern of village self-government provided the cultural and political template for later constitutional ideas of "village panchayats" as units of self-government. This historical memory informed both nationalist leaders and post-Independence policymakers, who looked to recover and re-invent village institution-based democracy within a modern constitutional framework.

2.2 Colonial interventions and the Ripon Resolution (1882)

British colonial rule disrupted many indigenous forms of village governance by centralizing authority in revenue and judicial departments. Nonetheless, by the late nineteenth century, colonial administrators began to recognize the utility of local bodies for limited administrative and financial tasks.

The most significant early intervention was Lord Ripon's Local Self-Government Resolution of 1882, which is widely regarded as the formal starting point of modern local-body governance in India. Ripon proposed the establishment of elected local bodies—municipalities in urbanstrict and local boards in rural areas—with certain powers over local taxati areas and dion, public works, and local services. Although Ripon's vision was largely urban-centric and limited in scope, the Resolution laid the conceptual groundwork for later experiments in rural self-government and introduced the idea that local bodies could be both elected and financed through local revenues.

Colonial-era district boards and local bodies, however, remained subordinate to district collectors and higher-level officials, and real authority remained concentrated in the executive. As a result, local self-government remained more formal than substantive, foreshadowing the difficulties that would later recur in PRI design.

2.3 Nationalist and Gandhian visions of village self-government

In the freedom-movement era, leaders such as Mahatma Gandhi articulated a powerful moral and political vision of village self-rule. Gandhi argued that India's true democracy lay in self-reliant, self-governing villages, describing the village panchayat as the "real republic" and the "largest pattern of democracy." He envisioned panchayats as autonomous units managing local economy, justice, education, and moral life, thereby combining political participation with social reform.

These Gandhian ideas deeply influenced the Constitution-makers' insertion of Article 40 in the Directive Principles of State Policy, which obliges the State to "organise village panchayats and endow them with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as units of self-government." While Article 40 was non-justiciable, it provided a constitutional-moral mandate for later committees and legislation to institutionalize village self-government.

2.4 Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1957) and the three-tier model

After Independence, the Government of India established the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee (1957) to examine the working of community development projects and to recommend a structure for local self-government. The Committee's report is widely regarded as the first major blueprint for the modern Panchayati Raj system.

The Mehta Committee recommended a **three-tier structure** of rural local bodies:

- a **Gram Panchayat** at the village level;
- a **Panchayat Samiti** at the block (intermediate) level; and
- a **Zila Parishad** at the district level.

This structure was designed to decentralize development planning and administration, with each tier having specific functions and linkages to higher levels. The report also emphasized the importance of **popular participation**, **democratic elections**, and **local financial resources** as essential ingredients of an effective Panchayati Raj system.

Although the Mehta model was implemented in several states, its implementation was uneven and often limited by bureaucratic control and weak financial devolution. Nevertheless, the three-tier idea became the de facto template for later constitutional design.

2.5 Ashok Mehta Committee (1977) and the push for stronger decentralization

Nearly two decades later, the Ashok Mehta Committee (1977) was appointed to review the working of the Panchayati Raj system and to suggest reforms. The Committee found that PRIs had become largely moribund, dependent on state departments, and lacking in political autonomy and financial resources.

The Ashok Mehta Committee recommended several key reforms:

- **Strengthening the Zila Parishad** as the pivotal body of rural local government, with powers over planning and development at the district level;
- Replacing the Panchayat Samiti with a **Mandal Panchayat** at the intermediate level to reduce bureaucratisation;
- Ensuring that PRIs were **constitutionally recognised** and backed by dedicated legislation;
- Providing for **regular elections** and **autonomous taxing and borrowing powers** to enhance financial autonomy.

While many states did not fully adopt the Mandal model, the Committee's emphasis on constitutional backing, stronger district-level bodies, and fiscal autonomy directly influenced later constitutional thinking and the eventual 73rd Amendment.

2.6 Other intermediate committees and the road to constitutionalisation

After the Ashok Mehta Committee, several other committees continued to emphasize the need for constitutional protection and effective decentralization. Notably, the **G.V.K. Rao Committee (1985)** and the **Laxmikant Rao Committee (later incorporated into the 73rd Amendment discourse)** reiterated that PRIs should be the primary vehicles for implementing rural development programmes and that state governments should devolve functions, funds, and functionaries in a systematic manner.

These committees collectively highlighted the persistent gap between the constitutional-moral promise of Article 40 and the weak, department-centric implementation of local governance. Their recommendations converged around three core demands:

- constitutional recognition of PRIs;
- a uniform three-tier structure; and
- a clear legal framework for devolution of powers and resources.

This cumulative critique laid the groundwork for the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, which transformed PRIs from ad-hoc administrative bodies into a constitutionally entrenched system of local self-government.

2.7 From colonial resolutions to constitutional amendment

The historical arc from the Ripon Resolution of 1882 to the 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, reflects a gradual, contested, and incomplete journey toward genuine democratic decentralization. Colonial reforms introduced elective local bodies but embedded them within a highly centralised administrative structure. Post-Independence committees, starting with Balwant Rai Mehta and continuing with Ashok Mehta, G.V.K. Rao, and others, sought to deepen local autonomy and planning capacity, but much of their vision remained unrealized.

The 73rd Amendment finally provided the missing constitutional backing, giving PRIs a uniform structure, electoral safeguards, reservations, and a functional mandate under the Eleventh Schedule. Yet, as later chapters will show, the constitutional text did not automatically resolve the contradictions inherited from colonial centralisation and post-Independence departmentalism.

This chapter thus situates the present-day Panchayati Raj Institutions within a long historical continuum, showing how pre-colonial traditions, colonial reforms, Gandhian idealism, and decades of committee-driven reform all converge in the constitutional-institutional architecture of local self-government in rural India.

Chapter 3 – Constitutional Framework

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, marks a turning point in the constitutional-institutional history of rural India by inserting **Part IX** ("The Panchayats," Articles 243–243O) into the Constitution and adding the **Eleventh Schedule**. This chapter sets out the core constitutional architecture of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs), explaining the text, structure, and normative logic of Part IX, the interplay between Articles 243–243O, and the significance of the Eleventh Schedule in allocating subjects for local governance. The chapter will also analyse how this framework attempts to translate the constitutional-moral mandate of **Article 40** into a justiciable, institutional reality.

3.1 The 73rd Amendment and insertion of Part IX

The 73rd Constitutional Amendment Act, 1992, formally titled *The Constitution (Seventy-third Amendment) Act, 1992*, came into force on **24 April 1993** and introduced **Part IX** from Articles 243 to 243O. Prior to this amendment, local self-government in rural India rested largely on Directive Principle Article 40 and a patchwork of state-level Panchayati Raj Acts, making PRIs constitutionally weak and administratively vulnerable.

The Amendment's primary objective was to implement Article 40 by giving PRIs **constitutional status, institutional permanence, and statutory uniformity** across states. It also sought to:

- institutionalize democratic decentralization;
- strengthen the three-tier structure of PRIs; and
- provide a constitutional basis for devolution of functions, funds, and functionaries.

Part IX is thus a foundational constitutional chapter for rural local self-government, comparable in structural importance to Part III (Fundamental Rights) and Part IV (Directive Principles), albeit in the domain of sub-national local governance.

3.2 Structure of Part IX: Articles 243–243O

Part IX contains a carefully sequenced cluster of provisions regulating the existence, composition, powers, and accountability of panchayats. The key Articles can be grouped thematically as follows:

3.2.1 Definitions and general framework (Article 243)

Article 243 defines core terms such as "Panchayat," "Gram Sabha," and "Panchayat area," laying the conceptual groundwork for the rest of Part IX. These definitions map the territorial, functional, and electoral space of PRIs and help distinguish panchayats from other local bodies or administrative entities.

3.2.2 Gram Sabha and Gram Panchayat (Articles 243A–243B)

- **Article 243A** constitutionally recognizes the **Gram Sabha**, defined as the assembly of all adult residents of the Gram Panchayat area, and directs states to provide for its powers and functions through law. The Gram Sabha is envisaged as the primary site of participatory democracy and local deliberation.
- **Article 243B** mandates the establishment of **Panchayats at three levels**: Gram (village), Panchayat Samiti (intermediate/block), and Zila Parishad (district), with a two-tier option for smaller states. This constitutionalizes the three-tier structure first recommended by the Balwant Rai Mehta Committee.

3.2.3 Composition, elections, and reservations (Articles 243C–243F)

- **Article 243C** provides for the composition of panchayats, requiring them to consist of elected members, with the possibility of co-opting certain categories such as experts or nominated women/SCs/STs (to the extent permitted by state law).
- **Article 243D** mandates **reservation of seats** for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and women, with reservation percentages roughly corresponding to their population and at least one-third of seats and chairpersons for women. Many states have since enhanced this to 50 percent reservation for women.
- **Article 243E** provides for a **five-year term** and automatic dissolution, with elections to be completed within six months of dissolution.
- **Article 243F** lists grounds for **disqualification** of members, such as disqualification for contesting Parliament/State legislature, and allows states to prescribe further conditions by law.

These provisions collectively aim to ensure **representative democracy, inclusiveness, and electoral regularity** at the grassroots, making Part IX one of the most explicit constitutional commitments to marginalized-group representation in the world.

3.2.4 Powers, functions, and fiscal autonomy (Articles 243G–243H)

- **Article 243G** is the core functional provision, empowering **state legislatures** to endow panchayats with "powers and authority to function as institutions of self-government" and to entrust them with functions and responsibilities relating to the 29 subjects in the **Eleventh Schedule**. States may also authorize panchayats to prepare plans for economic development and social justice, thereby embedding PRIs within the developmental-planning machinery.
- **Article 243H** empowers panchayats to **levy, collect, and appropriate taxes, duties, tolls, and fees**, subject to state law, and provides for the constitution of **Panchayat funds** at district and state levels. This is the constitutional basis for fiscal decentralization, though actual revenue-raising powers remain limited in many states.

3.2.5 Finance Commission, audit, and elections (Articles 243I–243K)

- **Article 243I** mandates the constitution of a **State Finance Commission** every five years to review the financial position of panchayats and recommend principles for devolution of funds from the state to PRIs. This institutionalizes the principle that financial transfers must be guided by independent, periodic review rather than arbitrary executive discretion.
- **Article 243J** provides for the **audit of accounts** of panchayats, ensuring financial accountability and transparency.
- **Article 243K** entrusts the **State Election Commission** with the preparation of electoral rolls and the conduct of all panchayat elections, insulating the electoral process from direct executive control.

3.2.6 Application, continuation, and limitations (Articles 243L–243O)

- **Article 243L** empowers Parliament to extend Part IX to **Union Territories**, subject to modifications.
- **Article 243M** excludes certain areas (mainly tribal areas under the Fifth Schedule and some autonomous regions) from automatic application of Part IX, paving the way for special arrangements such as the **Panchayats (Extension to Scheduled Areas) Act, 1996 (PESA)**.
- **Article 243N** provides for the **continuance of existing panchayats and laws** until re-constituted under the new framework, ensuring a transitional regime.
- **Article 243O** bars courts from interfering in panchayat elections on grounds other than those specified in election-related laws, emphasizing that electoral disputes should be resolved through the **election machinery and prescribed procedures** rather than general judicial review.

3.3 The Eleventh Schedule: functional mandate of PRIs

The Eleventh Schedule, added by the 73rd Amendment, lists **29 subjects** over which panchayats may be entrusted with "powers and authority" by state legislatures. These subjects span economic development, social welfare, and local-level service delivery, giving PRIs a broad, multi-dimensional mandate. The list includes:

1. Agriculture (including agricultural extension), land improvement, soil conservation, and land reforms.
2. Minor irrigation, water management, and watershed development.
3. Animal husbandry, dairying, and poultry; fisheries.
4. Social forestry, farm forestry, and minor forest produce.
5. Small-scale, khadi, village, and cottage industries.
6. Rural housing, drinking water, fuel and fodder, and maintenance of community assets.
7. Roads, bridges, ferries, and other rural communication.
8. Rural electrification and non-conventional energy sources.
9. Poverty-alleviation and social-welfare schemes, including welfare of weaker sections, SCs, STs, women, children, and persons with disabilities.
10. Health, sanitation, family welfare, and public distribution systems.
11. Education (primary, secondary, adult, and non-formal), libraries, and cultural activities.

The Eleventh Schedule thus positions PRIs as the **primary institutional nodes** for implementing a wide range of rural-development and social-welfare programmes, including major national schemes such as MGNREGA, health and sanitation drives, and education initiatives. However, the constitutional text adopts an enabling, rather than exhaustive, approach: it does not **automatically transfer** all 29 subjects to PRIs, but instead empowers states to decide the **extent and manner** of devolution.

This leaves significant room for **variation across states** and raises a central legal question: whether the constitutional scheme obliges states to devolve more than a minimal set of functions, and how far courts can intervene when devolution remains limited.

3.4 Interplay between Part IX and Article 40

Article 40, which directs the State to organize village panchayats and endow them with necessary powers and authority, is a Directive Principle of State Policy and therefore **non-justiciable in its own right**. The 73rd Amendment can be seen as the **constitutional execution** of Article 40, converting a moral-political directive into a justiciable institutional framework.

Part IX operationalises Article 40 by:

- constitutionally **recognizing** panchayats as institutions of self-government;
- providing a **uniform structure** (three-tier system) and **electoral safeguards**;
- mandating **reservation**, regular elections, and financial commissions; and
- endowing states, through Article 243G and the Eleventh Schedule, with the duty to devolve functions and powers.

Judicial pronouncements have interpreted this linkage as a constitutional commitment to democratic decentralization, insisting that PRIs must not be reduced to mere implementing agencies of departments. The interaction between Article 40 and Part IX thus forms the **constitutional core** of the present-day legal-institutional framework of Panchayati Raj.

3.5 Constitutional federalism and state-level discretion

Part IX deliberately preserves a significant degree of **state-level discretion** over the detailed design of PRIs, while embedding a **constitutional skeleton**. Under Article 243G, states are free to choose **which subjects** from the Eleventh Schedule to devolve, how to **organize** the three-tier structure within their territory, and what **procedural and administrative mechanisms** to prescribe for PRI functioning.

This dual structure creates a classic **constitutional-federal tension**: on one hand, the Constitution guarantees the universal existence and basic structure of PRIs; on the other, it permits wide variation in their **functional strength, fiscal autonomy, and administrative independence** across states. Legal-institutional analysis must therefore examine not only the constitutional text, but also how state Panchayati Raj Acts, Finance Commissions, and High-Court decisions translate Part IX into practice.

Empirical and comparative work shows that states such as **Kerala, Karnataka, and some northeastern states** have devolved relatively more functions and resources, while others remain highly centralised in their governance model. This interstate variation raises questions about the adequacy of a **minimal constitutional standard** and the role of **judicial and policy interventions** in ensuring substantive decentralization.

3.6 Judicial engagement with Part IX and democratic decentralization

Indian courts have played a crucial role in interpreting the normative content of Part IX and clarifying the constitutional vision of democratic decentralization. A recurring theme in jurisprudence is the insistence that PRIs are "institutions of self-government" and that the 73rd Amendment seeks to empower local bodies, not merely use them as **auxiliaries of the state executive**.

Judicial pronouncements have addressed several key issues:

- The **independence and integrity** of State Election Commissions and the bar on arbitrary interference in panchayat elections under Article 243O;
- The **justiciable implications** of Article 40 and Part IX in relation to inadequate devolution;
- The **constitutional basis** for reservations and social-audit mechanisms; and
- The limits of **state discretion** in diluting Gram Sabha powers or bypassing elected bodies.

However, the enforcement gap remains notable: judicial rhetoric about local self-government frequently outpaces the ground-level reality of departmental control and weak local capacity. This highlights the need for **institutional, legislative, and capacity-building reforms** alongside doctrinal clarity.

3.7 Challenges and contradictions within the constitutional framework

Despite its progressive architecture, the constitutional framework of Part IX is not without contradictions and challenges. Key tensions include:

- **Formal vs. substantive decentralization**: Part IX provides PRIs with constitutional status, elections, and reservations, but many states fail to devolve substantial functions, funds, and functionaries, leaving PRIs weak and dependent.
- **Fiscal asymmetry**: Although Article 243H and Article 243I provide the basis for Panchayat funds and State Finance Commissions, PRIs often remain reliant on central and state transfers, with limited locally-raised revenues.
- **Administrative over-control**: Executive departments frequently retain veto powers, effectively subordinating PRIs to higher-level authorities.
- **Exclusion within inclusion**: Reservations and electoral provisions increase representation of women and marginalized groups, but social hierarchies can reproduce informal control and "proxy" representation.
- **Territorial limits**: Article 243M excludes certain Scheduled Areas, necessitating special regimes such as PESA, which in turn raise questions of legal pluralism and constitutional-customary harmony.

Recognizing these tensions is essential for a critical legal-research perspective: Part IX sets an **aspirational constitutional framework**, but its effectiveness depends on **state-level implementation, judicial interpretation, and civil-society mobilization**.

3.8 Significance of this chapter for the legal-research argument

This constitutional-framework chapter is central to the present legal-research article because it establishes the **normative and doctrinal foundation** for analysing PRIs as institutions of local self-government. By unpacking the text, sequence, and interplay of Articles 243–243O, the role of the Eleventh Schedule, and the constitutional-federal dynamics of state-level discretion, the chapter provides the conceptual tools for:

- assessing the **gap between constitutional intent and institutional practice**;
- critically evaluating state Panchayati Raj Acts and devolution patterns; and
- engaging with judicial and policy debates on the future of democratic decentralization in rural India.

Subsequent chapters will build on this constitutional base to examine the **institutional design, empirical functioning, and reform prospects** of Panchayati Raj Institutions, always returning to the text and spirit of Part IX as the core constitutional benchmark.

Chapter 4 – Structure of Panchayati Raj

The Panchayati Raj system in India is built on a **three-tier institutional architecture**: **Gram Panchayat** at the village level, **Panchayat Samiti** at the block (intermediate) level, and **Zila Parishad** at the district level. This hierarchical yet interlinked structure is designed to ensure that local governance is neither too atomised at the village level nor too remote at the district level, but instead forms a coherent, cascading system of planning, implementation, and accountability across rural India.

This chapter elaborates the constitutional-statutory design of each tier, examines their composition, functions, and inter-tier relationships, and critically analyses how this structure operationalises the constitutional vision of local self-government and democratic decentralisation.

4.1 Gram Panchayat: the base unit of local self-government

The **Gram Panchayat** is the basic unit of local governance in the Panchayati Raj system, functioning at the **village or group-of-village level**. It is directly elected by adult residents of the village (or cluster of villages) and typically comprises several **ward members (Panchs)** and a **Sarpanch/Mukhiya/Village Head** who presides over meetings and acts as the executive-ceremonial head.

4.1.1 Composition and electoral structure

- Members are elected **ward-wise** from adult voters in each ward, with reservations for **Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and women** as mandated by the 73rd Amendment.
- The **Gram Sabha**, consisting of all adult residents of the village, serves as the broader participatory forum that deliberates on plans, budgets, and major decisions, though its powers and meeting frequency vary by state law.

4.1.2 Functions and responsibilities

Gram Panchayats discharge a wide range of **administrative, developmental, and welfare-oriented functions**, often drawing from the Eleventh Schedule. Typical responsibilities include:

- Local infrastructure: maintenance and construction of village roads, lanes, drains, bridges, street lighting, and public wells.
- Basic services: water supply, sanitation, solid-waste management, and street-lighting.
- Social welfare: implementation of poverty-alleviation schemes, targeting of beneficiaries, and coordination with other departments.
- Economic functions (often shared with higher tiers): support for small-scale and cottage industries, minor irrigation works, and community assets.

In many states, Gram Panchayats also have **adjudicatory or quasi-judicial roles** through Nyaya Panchayats or local dispute-resolution mechanisms, though the extent of jurisdiction and legal powers depends on state legislation.

4.1.3 Position in the three-tier system

Gram Panchayat is the **first-order decision-making unit** where local preferences are most directly reflected. It prepares local development plans and budgets, which are then aggregated and reviewed at the block level by the Panchayat Samiti. This downward-upward flow of plans and resources lies at the heart of the Panchayati Raj model of **participatory planning**.

4.2 Panchayat Samiti: the intermediate, coordinating tier

The **Panchayat Samiti** (also known as Block Panchayat, Panchayat Union, or Mandal Panchayat in some states) operates at the **block or taluka level**, acting as the **intermediary** between Gram Panchayats and the Zila Parishad. It is frequently described as the "link" tier that harmonises, aggregates, and supervises the activities of several Gram Panchayats within a defined administrative block.

4.2.1 Composition and membership

- Members of the Panchayat Samiti are usually **elected representatives from the villages** within the block, along with the **Sarpanchs of Gram Panchayats** in that jurisdiction and, in some states, nominated members such as experts or officers.
- The Samiti is headed by a **Chairperson/Pradhan** and may be supported by **Standing Committees** on finance, education, health, and development.

The constitutional-design under the 73rd Amendment leaves the detailed composition to state laws, resulting in **variation in size, representation, and powers** across states.

4.2.2 Functions and coordinating role

The Panchayat Samiti performs several key functions:

- **Aggregation and scrutiny of plans**: it collects and evaluates the development plans and budget proposals submitted by Gram Panchayats, adjusting them for financial feasibility and block-level priorities.
- **Resource allocation**: it decides how to allocate grants and other funds among Gram Panchayats, often prioritising urgent infrastructure or welfare needs.
- **Implementation and supervision**: it takes the lead in implementing block-level projects such as minor irrigation, common service centres, and integrated rural development schemes.
- **Coordination**: it coordinates activities of different Gram Panchayats, resolves inter-village or inter-ward disputes over resources, and liaises with the Zila Parishad and state departments.

By functioning as a **middle tier of consolidation**, the Panchayat Samiti helps avoid duplication of efforts and ensures that village-level priorities are aligned with broader block-level and even district-level objectives.

The **Zila Parishad** (also known as Zila Panchayat or District Panchayat) is the **highest tier** of the Panchayati Raj system, operating at the **district level** and overseeing all rural Panchayati Raj bodies within that district. It represents the entire rural population of the district and is collectively responsible for district-level planning, coordination, and monitoring.

4.3 Zila Parishad: the apex rural-local authority

The **Zila Parishad** (also known as Zila Panchayat or District Panchayat) is the **highest tier** of the Panchayati Raj system, operating at the **district level** and overseeing all rural Panchayati Raj bodies within that district. It represents the entire rural population of the district and is collectively responsible for district-level planning, coordination, and monitoring.slideshare+2

4.3.1 Composition and leadership

- The Zila Parishad typically consists of **elected representatives** from Panchayat Samitis, with the **Chairpersons of Panchayat Samitis** often serving as ex-officio members.
- It may also include representatives from **Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and women**, as well as members nominated by the state government in certain categories, subject to constitutional and state-law limits.
- The body is headed by an elected **Chairperson/President** and supported by several **Standing Committees** (e.g., finance, planning, health, education).

Because representation is primarily **indirect** (via Samitis), the Zila Parishad embodies a **multi-tiered representative structure**, balancing proximity to the grassroots with the capacity for region-wide planning.

4.3.2 Functions and district-level mandate

The Zila Parishad discharges primarily **planning-cum-supervisory functions**, including:

- **District-level planning**: preparing and approving the overall rural development plan for the district, integrating plans from Panchayat Samitis and Gram Panchayats.
- **Resource management**: allocating and monitoring the flow of funds and schemes to lower tiers, ensuring that resource distribution is equitable and need-based.
- **Coordination and supervision**: supervising the performance of Panchayat Samitis and Gram Panchayats, resolving administrative and financial bottlenecks, and advising the state government on rural-development priorities.
- **Implementation of larger schemes**: overseeing the implementation of major state and central schemes, such as MGNREGA, rural housing, and health- and education-related programmes.

In many states, the Zila Parishad also functions through **sector-specific committees**, which enhance technical and managerial oversight in areas like agriculture, health, and education.

4.4 Inter-tier relationships and cascading of authority

The three-tier structure is intentionally designed as a **hierarchical yet interdependent system**, with vertical and horizontal linkages that facilitate both **political representation** and **functional coordination**.

- **Vertical linkage**:
- Gram Panchayat → Panchayat Samiti → Zila Parishad: plans, budgets, and performance reports move upward, while policies, funds, and guidelines move downward.
- Each tier acts as a check on the others, with higher tiers reviewing and supervising, and lower tiers providing feedback and local-level data.
- **Horizontal linkage**:
- Within each tier, **ward-level members** and **Standing Committees** facilitate internal coordination and specialisation.
- Across villages and blocks, Panchayati Raj institutions participate in **inter-Panchayat forums** or district-level councils where common issues such as water-allocation or inter-block infrastructure are discussed.

This inter-tier configuration is meant to reconcile **local autonomy** with **regional-level coherence**, ensuring that no single village or block can be bypassed in planning while also preventing excessive fragmentation of administrative effort.

4.5 Variations across states and legal-institutional design

Although the 73rd Amendment mandates a **three-tier structure**, the **details of composition, powers, and nomenclature** vary across states, leading to a **constitutional-uniform but institutionally-diverse** pattern.

- **Nomenclature and tiers**: some states use "Panchayat Unions" or "Mandal Panchayats" instead of "Panchayat Samitis," and the exact definition of a "block" or "district" can differ.
- **Direct- vs. indirect-election link**: while Gram Panchayat members are directly elected, members of Panchayat Samiti and Zila Parishad are mostly elected indirectly from lower tiers, though modalities differ by state law.
- **Functional distribution**: some states assign more substantive powers to Gram Panchayats (e.g., in local grievance redressal and minor works), while others retain key functions at the block or district level.

These variations invite critical legal analysis of whether the constitutional minimum standard adequately guarantees **meaningful decentralisation** or if state-level design often reproduces centralised control under a decentralised façade.

4.6 Gram Sabha and the role of participatory democracy within the structure

The constitutional-institutional design of the three-tier system is incomplete without considering the **Gram Sabha**, which is recognised under Article 243A and operates at the **village level**, below the Gram Panchayat. The Gram Sabha, as the assembly of adult residents, is the constitutional site of **participatory democracy**, where villagers can:

- participate in the formulation of local development plans;
- scrutinise approved works and beneficiary lists;
- deliberate on social-welfare issues and local norms; and
- exercise **social audit** or oversight over PRI functioning.

In practice, however, the effectiveness of the Gram Sabha depends heavily on state-level rules regarding its frequency of meetings, quorum, and powers. In many districts, Gram Sabha meetings are irregular or symbolic, while in a few progressive states they have become vibrant forums of deliberation.

From a legal-research perspective, the Gram Sabha is best understood as the **democratic base** of the three-tier structure, mediating between popular will and formal institutional representation.

4.7 Structural strengths and systemic weaknesses

The three-tier structure exhibits several notable **constitutional-institutional strengths**, including:

- clear **territorial demarcation** of village, block, and district levels;
- a **cascading flow of plans and resources** that theoretically links local priorities to regional planning;
- a system of **checks and balances** across tiers, reducing the risk of local patronage capture at any single level.

At the same time, the structure faces several **systemic weaknesses**:

- **Bureaucratic over-control**: executive departments often retain effective veto powers over decisions taken at Gram Panchayat and Samiti levels, undermining meaningful decentralisation.
- **Limited capacity**: many elected representatives at all tiers lack training in planning, finance, and technical management, weakening their ability to exercise delegated powers.
- **Inadequate devolution**: some states devolve only minor functions to Gram Panchayats while keeping crucial planning and financial authority at the district or departmental level.

These structural tensions are central to the constitutional-legal critique of Panchayati Raj and will be further explored in later chapters on **implementation, finance, and judicial interpretation**.

4.8 Significance of this chapter for the legal-research framework

This chapter on the **structure of Panchayati Raj** provides the institutional-architectural foundation for the broader legal-research article. By mapping the constitutional-statutory design of Gram Panchayat, Panchayat Samiti, and Zila Parishad, and their inter-tier relationships, the chapter equips the reader with:

- a clear understanding of **how local self-government is institutionally organised** in rural India;
- the tools to analyse **devolution, power-sharing, and accountability** across tiers; and
- a framework for comparing **state-specific adaptations** of the three-tier model.

Subsequent chapters will build on this structural-institutional base to examine the **functional performance, fiscal-administrative dynamics, and judicial-constitutional interpretation** of Panchayati Raj Institutions, always returning to the three-tier architecture as the core constitutional-institutional reference point.

Chapter 5 – Powers and Functions

Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are not merely local-level administrative bodies but constitutionally mandated **institutions of local self-government** entrusted with a wide range of **developmental, welfare, and administrative functions** across rural India. Under Article 243G and the **Eleventh Schedule**, state legislatures are empowered to devolve significant powers over sectors such as **sanitation, water supply, roads, rural housing, education, and health**, thereby making PRIs central actors in the delivery of basic public services and the implementation of national-level welfare schemes.

This chapter systematically unpacks the **legal-statutory powers** and **substantive functions** of Panchayats, focusing on key service-delivery domains and assessing how these functions translate the constitutional ideal of "local self-government" into concrete governance practice.

5.1 Constitutional and statutory basis of PRI powers

The functional mandate of Panchayats is derived primarily from **Article 243G** and the **Eleventh Schedule** of the Constitution, as implemented through state-specific Panchayati Raj Acts. Article 243G authorizes state legislatures to endow Panchayats with **powers and authority to function as institutions of self-government** and to entrust them with responsibilities relating to the **29 subjects** listed in the Eleventh Schedule.

Those 29 subjects span:

- agriculture, land improvement, and minor irrigation;
- animal husbandry, fisheries, and forestry;
- rural housing, drinking water, and fuel and fodder;
- roads, rural electrification, and non-conventional energy;
- education, health, sanitation, and social welfare; and
- poverty-alleviation and public-distribution-system-related functions.

Although the constitutional text is **enabling** (i.e., it leaves the detailed devolution to state law), the Eleventh Schedule defines the outer **functional horizon** within which Panchayats can exercise powers. Comparative-statutory analysis shows that the **actual scope of devolution** varies across states, with some delegating substantial planning and implementation powers and others treating PRIs more as implementing agencies supervised by departments.

5.2 Developmental functions of Panchayats

Beyond routine administration, Panchayats are constitutionally expected to act as **agents of rural development**, integrating local-level planning into the broader framework of national- and state-level strategies. Key developmental functions include:

- **Agriculture and allied activities**:
- assisting in crop planning, extension services, and dissemination of improved agricultural practices;
- implementing schemes on land-improvement, soil conservation, watershed development, and minor irrigation.
- **Livelihood and infrastructure**:
- promoting small-scale, khadi, village, and cottage industries;
- maintaining and constructing village roads, culverts, bridges, and other local-level infrastructure to support rural connectivity and market access.
- **Energy and sustainability**:
- facilitating rural electrification and distribution at the local level;
- managing non-conventional energy projects and local-level environmental-protection measures.

Developmental functions are often implemented through **Gram Panchayat Development Plans (GPDPs)** and **Panchayat-level implementation** of centrally sponsored schemes such as MGNREGA and PMAY-Gramin, which not only provide livelihoods but also create durable rural assets.

5.3 Welfare and social-development functions

PRIs play a crucial role in **social-welfare delivery**, particularly in the areas of **education, health, women and child development, and social security**.

- **Education**:
- maintaining and upgrading **primary and secondary schools**, including school buildings, sanitation, and basic infrastructure;
- supporting adult and non-formal education, libraries, and cultural activities to strengthen local-level human-capital development.
- **Health, sanitation, and family welfare**:
- managing local-level **sanitation, solid-waste management, and drainage** systems;
- supporting **primary health centres (PHCs)**, sub-centres, and dispensaries by coordinating vaccination campaigns, health-awareness drives, and sanitation-related interventions;
- implementing programmes on **family welfare, women and child development, and the welfare of persons with disabilities and weaker sections**.
- **Poverty-alleviation and public distribution**:
- identifying beneficiaries and implementing local-level components of **poverty-alleviation and social-assistance schemes**;
- assisting in the functioning of the **Public Distribution System (PDS)** at the village and block level, including monitoring fair-price-shop operations and grievance redressal.

These welfare functions place Panchayats at the **frontline of distributive justice**, as they decide or influence who receives benefits, how resources are allocated, and how programmes are prioritised.

5.4 Administrative and service-delivery functions

Administratively, Panchayats are responsible for maintaining basic civic infrastructure and ensuring the day-to-day functioning of local public services. Major administrative functions include:

- **Civic works and local infrastructure**:
- constructing and maintaining **village roads, lanes, drains, street-lights, and other local public works**;
- managing **community assets** such as common grazing lands, village ponds, and community halls.
- **Water supply and sanitation**:
- ensuring **drinking-water supply** through borewells, hand-pumps, water-supply projects, and water conservation measures;
- implementing **sanitation and solid-waste-management schemes**, including individual and community-level toilets and campaigns on open-defecation free (ODF) certification.
- **Local order and environment**:
- managing minor local-environmental and conservation-related activities (e.g., tree-plantation, waste management, and protection of local water bodies);
- in some states, overseeing **local markets, fairs, and minor regulatory activities** within the village or block.

Many of these functions are described in rural-governance literature as **"obligatory services"** or "core local services," because they directly affect the **health, safety, and quality of life** of rural residents.

5.5 Implementation of national and state welfare schemes

In practice, the powers and functions of Panchayats are increasingly exercised through the **implementation of large-scale national and state-level welfare schemes**, which are routed, at least partially, through PRIs. These include:

- **Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA)**:
- Panchayats prepare and implement local-level works, decide on the location of assets, and ensure wage-payments and transparency in muster-rolls.
- **Pradhan Mantri Awas Yojana–Gramin (PMAY-G)** and housing-related schemes:
- Panchayats help identify eligible beneficiaries and oversee the construction of rural-housing units, often coordinating with state housing departments.
- **Swachh Bharat Mission–Grameen (SBM-G)** and sanitation missions:
- Panchayats are central to planning toilet-construction drives, awareness campaigns, and ODF-plus follow-up activities.
- **Health and nutrition schemes (e.g., IMNCI, immunisation campaigns)**:
- Panchayats coordinate with **Anganwadi workers, ASHAs, and PHC staff** to ensure coverage in remote villages.

By embedding Panchayats in these schemes, the state entrusts them with **both technical and political responsibilities**: they must manage finances and logistics while also mediating conflicts over beneficiary selection and local-level priorities.

5.6 Overlapping jurisdiction and inter-departmental tensions

The wide functional mandate of Panchayats often leads to **overlapping jurisdiction** and **authority-conflict** with state departments. For example:

- **Health and sanitation**: Line departments (health, public-health-engineering, and rural-development) may retain control over building PHCs or major water-supply projects, while Panchayats handle local-level sanitation and solid-waste management.
- **Roads and infrastructure**: The Public Works Department (PWD) often controls "higher-level" roads, while Panchayats manage internal village roads and culverts.

- **Education**: State education departments hire teachers and manage curricula, while Panchayats maintain buildings and local-level infrastructure.

Such overlaps produce two recurring problems:

- **departmental over-control**, where departments treat Panchayats as subordinate implementing units rather than autonomous bodies; and
- **blurred accountability**, where neither PRIs nor departments fully assume responsibility for service-delivery failures.

Legal-research analysis must therefore scrutinise how **state-level laws and administrative rules** define the **functional boundaries** between Panchayats and line departments, and how these boundaries shape the **effective powers** of PRIs on the ground.

5.7 Financial and planning-related powers tied to functions

The exercise of developmental and welfare functions is inseparable from the **financial and planning-related powers** accorded to Panchayats. Under Article 243H, Panchayats may:

- **levy, collect, and appropriate taxes, duties, tolls, and fees** on local services and activities, subject to state law;
- **receive grants-in-aid** and **devolution from State Finance Commissions**; and
- **prepare and execute local development budgets** and plans through Gram Panchayat and Panchayat Samiti-level planning processes.

In practice, local-tax-raising powers remain limited, and Panchayats depend heavily on **centrally allocated and state-level funds**. Yet, the **constitutional-financial architecture** reinforces the idea that functions must be matched with **adequate financial resources**, and that Panchayats should not be saddled with responsibilities without corresponding financial authority.

5.8 Constraints on the exercise of powers and functions

Despite the constitutional breadth of their mandate, Panchayats often face **serious constraints** in discharging their powers and functions effectively. Major constraints include:

- **Inadequate devolution**: many states devolve only **low-powered or "idle" functions**, while retaining core planning and financial control at the departmental level.
- **Limited capacity**: elected representatives frequently lack training in **planning, finance, project management, and technical skills**, reducing their ability to utilize devolved powers.
- **Bureaucratic interference**: departmental officials may override Panchayat decisions, delay sanctions, or control key approvals, thereby **undermining the autonomy** of PRIs.
- **Political and social capture**: local elites, caste-based networks, or corrupt practices can distort the allocation of benefits and resources, turning welfare-oriented functions into instruments of patronage.

These constraints highlight the **gap between constitutional-statutory powers** and **institutional reality**, a central theme for legal-research critique in subsequent chapters.

5.9 Significance of this chapter for the legal-research framework

This chapter on **powers and functions** is crucial because it concretises the abstract constitutional-institutional framework of Part IX into a **sector-wise and service-based analysis** of PRI governance. By mapping the functional domains—**developmental, welfare, and administrative**, including sanitation, water supply, roads, rural housing, education, and health—the chapter:

- demonstrates how Panchayats are positioned as **key implementers of rural-development and social-welfare policy**;
- identifies the **legal and structural tensions** between devolution, departmental control, and overlapping jurisdiction; and
- provides the substantive basis for later analysis of **fiscal autonomy, capacity-building, and judicial-doctrinal debates** on the true scope of PRI powers.

Subsequent chapters will build on this functional mapping to examine **how well Panchayats actually perform** in these domains, and how law-reform, state-level policy, and judicial intervention can strengthen their ability to exercise their constitutional-statutory powers in a meaningful and inclusive manner.

Chapter 6 – Reservation and Representation

Reservation and representation in Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) are among the most transformative constitutional innovations in Indian rural governance. By mandating **reservation for women, Scheduled Castes (SCs), and Scheduled Tribes (STs)**, the 73rd Constitutional Amendment ensures that historically marginalised and excluded sections gain **systematic access to political power and decision-making at the grassroots**. Several states have gone beyond the constitutional minimum and introduced **50 percent reservation for women** at all levels of PRIs, thereby making India one of the largest sites of women's political representation in the world.

This chapter analyses the constitutional-statutory framework of reservation, the empirical impact of enhanced quotas for women, and the broader implications of these mechanisms for **inclusive representation, gender justice, and caste-based inclusion**.

6.1 Constitutional framework: Article 243D and 243T

The core legal basis for reservation in Panchayati Raj lies in **Article 243D** (and, by analogy, **Article 243T** for Municipalities) of the Constitution, inserted by the 73rd Amendment.

- **Reservation for SCs and STs**:
- Article 243D mandates that **seats in every Panchayat be reserved for SCs and STs** in proportion to their population in the Panchayat area, with the reservation rotating after each delimitation. This formalises the constitutional commitment to **caste-based political inclusion**, ensuring that SCs and STs are not treated as mere beneficiaries of schemes but as holders of political office and local-level authority.
- **Reservation for women**:
- The same Article provides that **not less than one-third (33.3%) of the total number of seats** in every Panchayat must be reserved for women, including women belonging to SCs and STs. Article 243T similarly mandates reservation of not less than one-third of chairperson positions for women.

Collectively, these provisions create a **three-dimensional reservation matrix**:

- seats for SCs and STs in proportion to population;
- at least one-third of all seats for women; and
- not less than one-third of chairperson posts for women.

This structure ensures that **intersectional representation**—for women from SC/ST backgrounds—is legally protected, even though the implementation of this protection in practice remains uneven.

6.2 50 percent reservation for women: state-level expansions

While the Constitution mandates a **minimum of 33.3%** reservation for women, many states have amended their Panchayati Raj Acts to raise the quota. As of recent data, **20 states** and **2 Union Territories** provide **50 percent reservation for women** in Panchayati Raj Institutions:

- Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Chhattisgarh, Gujarat, Haryana, Himachal Pradesh, Jharkhand, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Odisha, Punjab, Rajasthan, Sikkim, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, Tripura, Uttarakhand, and West Bengal;
- Union Territories: Lakshadweep and Dadra & Nagar Haveli and Daman & Diu.

Bihar was the first state to adopt 50 percent reservation for women in PRIs, later joined by states such as Madhya Pradesh, Uttarakhand, and Himachal Pradesh. This state-level experimentation has turned Panchayati Raj into a **laboratory of gender-quota politics**, where women now occupy a majority of elected seats in many rural councils.

From a constitutional-federal perspective, these state-level expansions reveal a **tension between constitutional minimums and progressive state legislations**: the Constitution sets a floor, while states can raise the ceiling, thereby deepening the normative commitment to gender equality in local-level politics.

6.3 Impact on women's political participation

The reservation regime has produced a **quantitative revolution** in women's political representation. By some estimates, the number of **elected women representatives in PRIs has risen from a few thousand in the pre-1992 era to over one million post-Amendment**, with many states crossing the 40–50 percent threshold.

Empirical and sociological studies highlight several positive trends:

- **Increased entry of women** into public life, including women from rural, low-income, and SC/ST backgrounds;
- **Greater responsiveness** of local bodies to issues such as water, sanitation, education, and violence against women, as women-led Panchayats often prioritise these concerns;
- **Emergence of women's leadership networks** and support groups, which help elected women navigate bureaucratic and patriarchal barriers.

However, scholars also caution that **representation is not equivalent to empowerment**. In many villages, women nominees act as **"proxy" leaders** for male relatives or local elites, and formal office-holding may not translate into substantive decision-making power.

6.4 Reservation for Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes

Reservation for SCs and STs under Article 243D aims to correct centuries of **caste-based exclusion and political marginalisation**. By reserving seats in proportion to their population, the scheme seeks to ensure that SCs and STs are not merely subjects of development but also **agents of local governance**.

Several features mark this reservation:

- **Proportional allocation**: reserved seats for SCs/STs mirror their share in the Panchayat-area population;
- **Rotation**: reserved constituencies or chairpersonships are rotated periodically to prevent the emergence of entrenched "token" elites;
- **Intersection with gender**: a significant portion of reserved seats also falls under the broader women-reservation bracket, creating a legal space for **Dalit and Adivasi women's leadership**.

On the ground, the picture is mixed. In some regions, SC/ST representatives have successfully challenged local-level caste hierarchies and improved the delivery of welfare schemes to marginalised communities. In others, **subordination within the party system, bureaucratic hostility, and social stigma** continue to constrain the effective exercise of power even when formal representation is strong.

6.5 Legal-constitutional challenges and doctrinal debates

The reservation regime has generated several **constitutional and legal controversies**. Key issues include:

- **Ceiling of 50 percent and intersectional quotas**:

- Courts have long held that reservations in elective bodies should not ordinarily exceed 50 percent of total seats, except in extraordinary circumstances. When states combine SC/ST reservations with enhanced women's quotas, they must ensure that the **aggregate reservation does not violate this ceiling**, requiring careful rotational design.
- **Rotation and periodic delimitation**:
- Article 243D and related provisions require periodic re-delimitation and rotation of reserved constituencies, raising questions about **political continuity, constituency loyalty, and the risk of destabilisation**.
- **"Proxy" leadership and capacity-building**:
- Judicial and policy discourse has increasingly recognised that **reservation of seats does not guarantee substantive power**. As a result, several states have introduced **training programmes, women's leadership cells, and grievance-redressal mechanisms** to ensure that reserved-category representatives can effectively exercise their constitutional-political roles.

6.6 Intersectionality, representation, and substantive inclusion

Reservation for women, SCs, and STs is best understood as an **intersectional project of representation**: it seeks to address overlapping forms of exclusion based on gender, caste, and class.

- **Women from SC/ST backgrounds** occupy a particularly vulnerable position in rural society, often facing triple discrimination. Reservation in PRIs offers them a **protected political space** to contest local power, even if the social obstacles remain formidable.
- **Dalit and Adivasi men**, while benefiting from caste-based reservations, also confront deeply entrenched power structures; however, the presence of SC/ST representatives in Panchayats has, in many instances, led to **greater assertiveness over land rights, forest-rights, and social-justice claims**.

Critical legal-sociological research argues that the reservation framework must be complemented by:

- mechanisms to **prevent tokenism and proxy nominations**;
- substantive **capacity-building and legal-rights awareness programmes**; and
- protections against **social and political intimidation or harassment** of marginalised representatives.

6.7 Significance of this chapter for the legal-research framework

This chapter on **reservation and representation** is central to the constitutional-normative analysis of Panchayati Raj Institutions because it focuses on the **democratic-inclusionary dimension** of the 73rd Amendment. By examining the constitutional text (Article 243D/243T), the expansion of women's reservation to 50 percent in many states, and the intersectional implications for SCs, STs, and women, the chapter:

- demonstrates how PRIs have become a **key institutional vehicle for deepening political participation** of historically marginalised groups;
- exposes the **gap between descriptive representation and substantive empowerment**, which is a core theme for subsequent legal-empirical critique; and
- provides the basis for assessing how law-reform and policy measures can strengthen **inclusive, accountable, and genuinely representative local self-government** in rural India.

Subsequent chapters will build on this representation-centric foundation to analyse **accountability mechanisms, social-audit processes, and judicial interventions** designed to ensure that reserved seats translate into real power rather than symbolic representation.

Chapter 7 – Judicial Interpretation

The judiciary has played a pivotal role in shaping the constitutional-political meaning of the Panchayati Raj system, clarifying critical issues relating to **Panchayat elections, reservations, devolution of powers, and the nature of local self-government**. Through a series of landmark judgments, including the seminal case of **Dr. K. Krishna Murthy v. Union of India (2010)**, the Supreme Court has interpreted the 73rd and 74th Amendments, upheld the constitutional validity of reservation in local bodies, and laid down guiding principles on the limits and design of affirmative action at the grassroots.

This chapter traces the evolving jurisprudence on Panchayati Raj, analyses the doctrinal significance of *K. Krishna Murthy*, and examines how courts have intervened in matters of **elections, reservation, and governance**, thereby bridging the gap between constitutional text and lived institutional practice.

7.1 Scope of judicial engagement with Panchayati Raj

The Supreme Court and various High Courts have engaged with Panchayati Raj issues along several doctrinal-functional axes:

- **Election-related disputes**: challenges to the **constitution of wards, delimitation, reservation of seats, and the conduct of polling** by the State Election Commission. Courts have repeatedly affirmed that while election-related matters are largely governed by the Election Commission's machinery, there is room for **judicial review when there is arbitrariness, malafide, or clear violation of constitutional-statutory provisions**.
- **Reservation of seats and chairpersons**: questions on the **constitutional validity of reservation for SCs, STs, and Other Backward Classes (OBCs)**, including the **quantum of reservation, rotation, and the ceiling of 50 percent**. Courts have used the "basic structure" doctrine and the distinction between **education/employment reservation (Articles 15 and 16)** and **reservation in local self-government (Articles 243D and 243T)** to craft a distinct constitutional-affirmative-action jurisprudence.
- **Devolution and autonomy**: litigation on the **extent of functional, fiscal, and administrative devolution** required by Part IX, and the degree of **state-level discretion** in delegating powers to Panchayats. Courts have repeatedly emphasised that PRIs are "institutions of self-government" and that states must not treat them as mere executive-implementing agencies.
- **Governance and accountability**: judicial review of **removal or suspension of Sarpanchs/Panchayat chairpersons**, the legality of **state-level ordinances or rules affecting Panchayat functioning**, and the role of **social-audit mechanisms** in ensuring transparency.

Through this multi-dimensional engagement, the judiciary has helped **convert the constitutional-moral vision of Article 40 and Part IX into a justiciable legal-institutional framework**.

7.2 Dr. K. Krishna Murthy v. Union of India (2010): doctrinal significance

The case of **Dr. K. Krishna Murthy v. Union of India (2010) 7 SCC 202** is arguably the most comprehensive Supreme Court pronouncement on the constitutional-legal architecture of reservation in local-self-government institutions, including Panchayats and Municipalities. A Constitution Bench examined the validity of several provisions inserted by the 73rd and 74th Amendments, particularly **Article 243D and Article 243T** and their sub-clauses dealing with **reservation and creamy-layer exclusion**.

7.2.1 Key constitutional questions

The Court addressed four core questions:

1. Whether **Article 243D(6)** and **Article 243T(6)**, which empower state legislatures to provide reservation of seats and chairperson positions for **"backward classes"** in Panchayats and Municipalities, are constitutionally valid.
2. Whether **Article 243D(4)** and **Article 243T(4)**, which authorise reservation of **chairperson posts** for SCs, STs, and women, violate the principles of equality and democracy.
3. Whether the **principles developed under Articles 15(4) and 16(4)** (for reservations in education and public employment) can be mechanically applied to reservations in local-self-government.
4. What **quantitative ceiling** (e.g., 50 percent) should govern reservations in local bodies, and whether exceptions can be carved out for particular groups.

7.2.2 Doctrinal holdings and constitutional reasoning

The Court's reasoning rests on three pillars: **functional distinction, constitutional-textual autonomy, and basic-structure-light proportionality**.

- **Distinct constitutional basis**: The Court held that reservations in Panchayats and Municipalities under **Article 243D and 243T** constitute a **distinct and independent constitutional domain**, different from the framework of Articles 15(4) and 16(4). The rationale is that local-self-government seeks **inclusive political representation and community-based participation**, not merely merit-based access to jobs or education.
- **Validity of backward-class reservation and chairperson-post reservation**:
- The Court upheld **Article 243D(6) and 243T(6)** as constitutionally valid, emphasising that they are enabling provisions that allow states to reserve seats and chairperson positions for **backward classes (OBCs)**, subject to the need for **empirical-based identification** of deprived groups.
- It also upheld **Article 243D(4) and 243T(4)**, which permit reservation of chairperson posts for SCs, STs, and women, rejecting the argument that reserving the single chairperson post violates equality or democracy. The Court distinguished such posts from solitary appointments in the public-employment context and stressed that the **rotational reservation model** ensures broader representation.
- **Ceiling of 50 percent and exceptions**:
- The bench reiterated that the **aggregate vertical reservation** for SCs, STs, and OBCs in Panchayats and Municipalities should not ordinarily exceed **50 percent**, in line with the traditional ceiling laid down in earlier constitutional jurisprudence.
- However, it acknowledged that **exceptional cases**—such as the need to safeguard the representation of Scheduled Tribes in Panchayats located in Scheduled Areas—could justify a departure from the 50 percent ceiling, subject to rigorous empirical justification.
- **Separate identification of backward classes**:
- The Court held that the identification of **"backward classes"** for the purpose of Article 243D/T(6) must be undertaken **independently** of the methodology used for identifying SEBCs under Article 15(4) and 16(4), because the **barriers to political participation** differ from those in education and employment.

7.2.3 Impact on reservation and empowerment debates

K. Krishna Murthy has become a **keystone judgment** in the doctrinal and policy-theoretical debates on affirmative action in local-self-government. It:

- validated the constitutional strategy of **multi-layered reservation** (for SCs, STs, women, and OBCs) as a legitimate tool for **deepening democratic inclusion**;
- reminded states that any reservation legislation enacted under these Articles must be **evidence-based and periodically reviewed**;
- left the door open for **challenges to state-level OBC-reservation statutes** before High Courts, provided petitioners demonstrate disproportionate or unreasonable quotas.

From a critical-legal perspective, the judgment also exposed the **tension between formal representation and substantive empowerment**, as it focused largely on constitutional-validity questions and less on the quality of participation in reserved seats.

7.3 Judicial review of Panchayat elections and delimitation

Beyond reservation, courts have repeatedly intervened in **Panchayat-election disputes**, clarifying the interplay between the **State Election Commission's authority** and **judicial-review safeguards**.

- **Reservation-based delimitation**:
- In several High Court decisions (including recent Tamil Nadu rulings), courts have **quashed Panchayat-election results** where seats were reserved for SCs or women despite the **absence of SC population** or **irregularities in voter-roll preparation**. The Court emphasises that reservation must be based on **actual demographic data** and **lawful electoral rolls**, and that any violation undermines the constitutional-egalitarian purpose of Article 243D.
- **Base-year and quantum-based disputes**:
- A notable line of litigation concerns the **base year for determining reservation quotas** and the **quantum of reservation** in state-level Panchayati Raj Acts. In some states, High Courts have directed the State Election Commission and State Government to **adopt the most recent census data** and ensure that the **aggregate reservation (SC/ST/OBC) does not exceed 50 percent**. The Supreme Court in *K. Krishna Murthy* and subsequent cases has affirmed these principles, reinforcing the **proportionality-cum-empirical-scrutiny** standard for reservation-design.
- **Judicial-review threshold**:

- Courts have clarified that while election-related matters are primarily administrative and must not be lightly interfered with, **clear illegality, arbitrariness, or constitutional-violation** (such as flawed reservation or defective notification) opens the door to judicial review. This approach seeks to balance **electoral efficiency** with **constitutional-democratic integrity**.

7.4 Judicial interventions on devolution and autonomy

Judicial interpretation has also shaped the **functional meaning** of Panchayati Raj by construing the **devolution obligations** under Part IX. Courts have consistently held that Article 40, read with **Article 243G and the Eleventh Schedule**, obliges states to make Panchayats **meaningful units of self-government**, not just implementers of state-departmental schemes.

Key doctrines emerging from case-law include:

- **"Institutions of self-government"**: PRIs must be allowed to exercise **real decision-making authority** over functions and funds, and not be reduced to subordinate executives.
- **Substantive devolution**: mere constitutional insertion does not satisfy the constitutional-moral mandate; states must **devolve adequate functions, funds, and functionaries** in a manner that enables PRIs to plan and implement effectively.
- **Financial-and-fiscal guarantees**: Courts have interpreted **Article 243I (State Finance Commission)** and **Article 243H (Panchayat funds)** to require **periodic, independent-based financial-devolution norms**, and have occasionally intervened when state-government conduct appears to undermine financial autonomy.

These doctrinal holdings form the **constitutional-federal backbone** of contemporary Panchayati Raj jurisprudence, anchoring the legal-research critique of **inadequate devolution and departmental over-control**.

7.5 Judicial review of governance and removal of representatives

Courts have also entered the domain of **Panchayat-governance practice**, examining the legality of **removal or suspension of elected representatives**, and the interaction between **executive action and democratic accountability**.

- **Suspension and removal of Sarpanchs/Chairpersons**:
- High Courts and the Supreme Court have reviewed state-government orders suspending or dismissing Panchayat leaders on grounds such as **corruption, incompatibility with office, or violation of party-affiliation rules**. Where the procedure is found to be arbitrary, non-transparent, or lacking in due-process safeguards, courts have **reinstated elected representatives** and underscored the importance of **political-as-well-as-procedural fairness**.
- **Role of social audit and transparency mechanisms**:
- Judicial pronouncements have also recognised the value of **social-audit mechanisms** and **citizen-led oversight** in Panchayat-governance, treating them as part of the broader **constitutional-transparency and accountability architecture**. In some states, courts have mandated the **regular holding of Gram Sabha meetings** and **public-reporting of Panchayat-level audits**, reinforcing the participatory-democratic vision of PRIs.

7.6 Limits, gaps, and critical questions in judicial jurisprudence

Despite its progressive-leaning orientation, the judicial-interpretation of Panchayati Raj is not without limits and contradictions.

- **Enforcement gap**: Courts often articulate strong constitutional visions of **local autonomy, adequate devolution, and inclusive representation**, but the **implementation** remains dependent on state-executive and bureaucratic cooperation, which is frequently weak.
- **Focus on formal-constitutional questions**: Much of the litigation, including *K. Krishna Murthy*, centres on **constitutional-validity and structural-design** rather than the **quality of participation, everyday corruption, or caste-based intimidation** faced by Panchayat representatives.

- **Over-reliance on state-level statistics**: Reservation-related jurisprudence leans heavily on **census data and state-commission reports**, yet social-scientific research shows that **political participation is shaped by informal networks, caste-patriarchal structures, and local-power dynamics** that are not fully captured by official statistics.

From a critical-legal-research perspective, this chapter therefore highlights the need to **move beyond doctrinal-constitutional analysis** and integrate **empirical and sociological insights** into the understanding of how judicial decisions translate (or fail to translate) into genuine local-self-government and inclusive representation.

7.7 Significance of this chapter for the legal-research framework

This chapter on **judicial interpretation** is central to the constitutional-institutional-doctrinal analysis of Panchayati Raj because it:

- maps the **key case-law** on Panchayat elections, reservations, devolution, and governance, with *K. Krishna Murthy (2010)* serving as the doctrinal anchor;
- clarifies how courts have **translated Article 40 and Part IX** into a **justiciable framework** for local-self-government and inclusive representation;
- exposes the **tensions between constitutional-textual guarantees and grounded-institutional practice**, thereby setting the stage for empirical-critical analysis in subsequent chapters.

By grounding the research in judicial-doctrinal analysis, the article positions itself at the intersection of **constitutional law, public-law theory, and empirical rural-governance studies**, offering a legally rigorous and contextually nuanced account of the evolving role of the judiciary in shaping Panchayati Raj Institutions as the constitutional architecture of local self-government in rural India.

Chapter 8: Systemic Challenges and Structural Impediments in Panchayati Raj Governance

While the Seventy-Third Constitutional Amendment Act of 1992 was heralded as a watershed moment for democratic decentralization in India, the operational reality of Part IX of the Constitution reveals a profound chasm between de jure autonomy and de facto subservience. The institutionalization of Panchayati Raj Institutions (PRIs) was envisioned to decentralize power, yet PRIs remain entangled in a web of systemic pathologies.

This chapter critically evaluates the structural, financial, and political impediments that continue to incapacitate Panchayats, focusing specifically on institutionalized corruption, fiscal castration, bureaucratic hegemony, and debilitating political interference.

8.1 The Anatomy of Corruption and Accountability Deficits

Corruption within PRIs is not merely an aggregation of isolated ethical lapses; rather, it is systemic, structural, and deeply embedded in the local socio-political fabric. The devolution of developmental funds to the grassroots level has frequently resulted in the decentralization of corruption rather than the decentralization of genuine governance.

- **The Nexus of Leakage:** A significant portion of funds allocated for rural employment, infrastructure (such as the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act), and housing schemes is siphoned off through an entrenched nexus of local politicians, contractors, and junior bureaucrats.
- **Asymmetry of Information:** Gram Sabhas, constitutionally mandated to act as institutions of direct democracy and social audit, are frequently reduced to rubber stamps. Due to widespread illiteracy, lack of digital transparency, and social stratification, marginalized groups are effectively excluded from monitoring expenditures.
- **The "Pradhan-Pati" Phenomenon:** Despite the progressive reservation of seats for women, patriarchal power structures often subvert this constitutional mandate. Male relatives (*Pradhan-patis* or *Sarpanch-patis*) wield actual administrative power, leading to a proxy governance model that masks exploitation and dilutes accountability.

8.2 Insufficient Financial Autonomy and the Crisis of Fiscal Federalism

The core of autonomous governance lies in fiscal self-reliance. However, an analysis of the financial architecture of PRIs reveals a state of chronic fiscal castration, rendering these local bodies perpetually dependent on higher echelons of government.

The structural reluctance of states to devolve meaningful revenue-raising powers creates an immediate shortfall. Consequently, Panchayats suffer from an anaemic local tax base, forcing an over-reliance on untied and tied grants-in-aid from the Centre and State governments. This financial dependency erodes fiscal autonomy, ultimately reducing PRIs to mere implementing arms of higher governance.

- **The Failure of Article 243-H:** While Article 243-H empowers State Legislatures to authorize Panchayats to levy, collect, and appropriate taxes, duties, tolls, and fees, the actual devolution of these powers has been dismal. States have historically retained lucrative tax bases, leaving Panchayats with inelastic, low-yielding revenue sources like property or lighting taxes, which are notoriously difficult to enforce locally.
- **The Pathology of Tied Grants:** The financial survival of PRIs is overwhelmingly dependent on devolved funds from State Finance Commissions (SFCs) and the Central Finance Commission (CFC). A vast majority of these funds come in the form of "tied grants"—funds strictly earmarked for specific central or state schemes. This top-down budgetary control strips Panchayats of the flexibility required to address localized priorities, effectively reducing them from self-governing entities to mere implementation agencies.

8.3 Bureaucratic Hegemony and the Compromise of Local Autonomy

The constitutional design under Part IX presupposes that bureaucrats would act as facilitators to elected local representatives. In practice, the administrative apparatus reflects a colonial-era hierarchy, maintaining a stubborn bureaucratic hegemony over rural local bodies.

- **The Parallel Authority of the Executive:** State legislations enacted pursuant to Article 243-G frequently vest overriding supervisory and punitive powers in district bureaucracies (such as the District Collector or Chief Executive Officer). Bureaucrats retain the statutory power to suspend or dismiss elected Panchayat heads, veto resolutions passed by the Panchayat, and freeze bank accounts under the guise of administrative oversight.
- **The Dilemma of Dual Control:** Staff assigned to Panchayats (such as engineers, line department workers, and secretaries) are routinely hired, transferred, and paid by the State Government, not the Panchayat itself. Consequently, their loyalty lies vertically with their parent state departments rather than horizontally with the elected Panchayat leadership. This lack of administrative control over their own human resources paralyzes the operational autonomy of PRIs.

8.4 Political Interference and the Subversion of the Democratic Mandate

Panchayats are intended to serve as arenas for participatory, localized problem-solving. However, they are increasingly weaponized as battlegrounds for macro-level partisan politics, subverting the true intent of local self-governance.

- **Encroachment by MPs and MLAs:** Members of Parliament (MPs) and Members of Legislative Assemblies (MLAs) often perceive strong, autonomous Panchayat leaders as direct threats to their local political hegemony. Through schemes like MPLADS and MLALADS, legislators execute parallel development projects within the jurisdiction of Panchayats without consulting the local bodies, thereby fragmenting local planning and eroding the authority of the Gram Panchayat.
- **The Weaponization of Dissolution and Delimitation:** State governments routinely exploit their statutory powers to delay Panchayat elections, extend the tenure of administrators, or gerrymander ward boundaries (delimitation) to favor the ruling party at the state level. This politically motivated manipulation undermines the predictability and sanctity of the local democratic cycle.

8.5 The Jurisprudential Dilemma: The Ambiguity of Article 243-G and Constitutional Under-enforcement

A foundational critique of the constitutional framework under Part IX lies in the drafting of Article 243-G itself. The provision states that State Legislatures *may* endow Panchayats with such powers and authority as may be necessary to enable them to function as institutions of self-government. The use of the word "may" instead of "shall" has proven to be a fatal jurisprudential flaw.

By framing the devolution of powers as a discretionary privilege rather than a mandatory obligation, the Constitution effectively left the survival of local democracy to the whims of regional political elites. This constitutional ambiguity has created two primary legal and operational crises:

- **The Incompleteness of the Eleventh Schedule:** Unlike the Seventh Schedule, which strictly delineates legislative competence between the Union and the States, the Eleventh Schedule is merely illustrative. It lists 29 subjects (such as agriculture, land improvement, and minor irrigation) that can be transferred to Panchayats, but it does not automatically vest these powers in them.
- **The Lack of Judicial Enforcement:** Because the devolution of these 29 subjects is dependent on state-specific legislation, the judiciary has generally adopted a hands-off approach. Courts routinely decline to issue writs of mandamus to compel state governments to transfer specific administrative functions, citing the wide legislative discretion built into the text of Article 243-G. Consequently, constitutional rights to local self-governance remain legally un-enforceable in practice.

8.6 Institutional Parallelism: The Deliberate Bypassing of Local Bodies

Rather than strengthening PRIs, both Central and State governments frequently establish parallel institutional mechanisms to execute rural development policies. This phenomenon, known as institutional parallelism, deliberately bypasses and marginalizes elected local bodies.

- **The Rise of Parastatal Agencies:** State governments often create specialized, bureaucratically driven parastatals—such as District Rural Development Agencies (DRDAs), State Water and Sanitation Missions, and dedicated corporate special purpose vehicles (SPVs)—to manage major developmental projects. These parastatals are heavily funded, vertically controlled by state headquarters, and entirely unaccountable to the local Gram Panchayat.
- **Line Departments as Gatekeepers:** Even within the 29 subjects listed in the Eleventh Schedule, state line departments (such as the Public Works Department, Forest Department, and Irrigation Department) continue to execute works independently. The elected Panchayat representatives are frequently reduced to mere onlookers or secondary beneficiaries, rather than the primary planning and executing authority envisioned by the Seventy-Third Amendment.

8.7 The Capacity Deficit: Socio-Technical Impediments to Governance

The structural devolution of power assumes a corresponding level of administrative and technical capacity within local bodies. However, the Indian state has largely failed to equip PRIs with the human capital and infrastructure necessary to manage complex public administration tasks.

- **Infrastructure and Digital Starvation:** A significant percentage of Gram Panchayats across India lack basic physical infrastructure. Many operate without dedicated *Panchayat Bhawans* (office buildings), reliable electricity, or stable internet connectivity. This severely undermines contemporary e-governance and digital accountability initiatives like the *e-GramSwaraj* portal.
- **Absence of Technical and Legal Expertise:** Modern local governance requires specialized skills, including asset mapping, double-entry bookkeeping, civil engineering for local public works, and basic legal literacy to interpret statutory rules. Because Panchayats lack the financial resources to hire dedicated accountants, engineers, or legal advisors, they remain entirely dependent on state-appointed officials who visit infrequently and exercise unchecked veto power over local plans.
- **Social Stratification and Captive Governance:** In regions with deep-seated caste and class hierarchies, the formal equality introduced by constitutional reservations is actively undermined by informal social coercion. Land-owning elites and dominant castes frequently manipulate or intimidate elected representatives from Scheduled Castes (SCs), Scheduled Tribes (STs), and Other Backward Classes (OBCs), rendering their constitutional empowerment superficial.

8.8 The Failure of the State Finance Commissions (SFCs)

The State Finance Commission (SFC) was designed under Article 243-I to serve as the fiscal equalizer, mirroring the role of the Central Finance Commission. The SFC is constitutionally mandated to review the financial position of Panchayats and recommend principles for the distribution of net tax proceeds between the State and local bodies. However, the institutional efficacy of the SFC has been systematically subverted.

State governments routinely delay setting up SFCs by years, resulting in prolonged fiscal uncertainty for local bodies. When these commissions do manage to submit reports, state governments frequently delay tabling them in legislatures,

often accepting recommendations selectively or rejecting them outright without objective justification. This leaves local bodies dependent on volatile, ad-hoc central grants rather than predictable, state-shared revenue streams.

8.9 Deconstructing the "3Fs": The Core Matrix of Disempowerment

The operational paralysis of the Panchayati Raj system can ultimately be summarized through the analytical framework of the "3Fs": **Funds, Functions, and Functionaries**. True democratic decentralization requires a balanced and simultaneous devolution of all three elements. The contemporary crisis of Indian local governance stems from a deliberate, structural asymmetry maintained by state governments across this matrix.

The state has decoupled these pillars. It may delegate functions (such as rural sanitation) without devolving the necessary funds to execute them, or it may assign funds but route them through state-controlled functionaries who bypass elected local councils. This fragmentation ensures that accountability remains vertical (toward state capitals) rather than horizontal (toward the rural electorate), leaving Part IX of the Constitution as a largely unfulfilled promise of democratic decentralization.

8.10 Conclusion

The cumulative effect of these institutional, structural, and political challenges is the systemic reduction of Panchayati Raj Institutions to weak, underfunded appendages of the State administrative machinery. The constitutional vision of Part IX—to transform Panchayats into resilient, independent institutions of self-government—remains heavily compromised.

Unless fundamental legal and structural reforms are introduced to mandate automatic fiscal devolution, enforce strict bureaucratic accountability to elected local leaders, and insulate local governance from partisan macro-politics, the promise of genuine grassroots democracy in India will remain an unfulfilled constitutional aspiration.

Chapter 9: Conclusion and Strategic Imperatives for Grassroots Democracy

The constitutionalization of the Panchayati Raj system via the Seventy-Third Amendment was anchored in the transformative promise of sub-state federalism—a vision to shift Indian democracy from a representative, top-down model to a participatory, bottom-up framework. Part IX of the Constitution provided a structural blueprint to empower the rural electorate, deliberately integrating marginalized communities into the institutional matrix of local governance.

However, as analyzed throughout this study, the operational trajectory of Panchayats reveals that structural devolution has not translated into genuine institutional autonomy. The system remains constrained by an incomplete transfer of powers, fiscal dependence, bureaucratic hegemony, and deep-seated political interference.

9.1 Reaffirming the Role of Panchayats in Grassroots Democracy

Despite severe systemic bottlenecks, Panchayats have fundamentally altered the political sociology of rural India. They have acted as vital instruments for deepening democratic consciousness and fostering civic engagement at the lowest echelons of society.

- **Democratic Broadening and Representation:** The mandatory reservation of seats has created a diverse leadership cadre, bringing millions of women, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and Backward Classes into formal political spaces. This has permanently disrupted traditional, oligarchic power structures in rural communities.
- **Localized Welfare and Responsiveness:** As the tier of governance closest to the citizenry, Panchayats possess an unparalleled information advantage regarding local ecological, economic, and social needs. When given the opportunity, they deliver highly targeted public goods—such as primary education, local sanitation, and rural connectivity—far more responsively than centralized state mechanisms.
- **The Gram Sabha as an Arena of Direct Democracy:** The institutionalization of the Gram Sabha provides a unique forum for deliberative democracy. It offers rural citizens a direct platform to question public expenditure, audit developmental works, and hold elected representatives accountable, laying the groundwork for a more transparent governance culture.

9.2 The Imperative of Institutional Strengthening

To transition Panchayats from mere executing agencies of state policy into true "institutions of self-government" under Article 243-G, a comprehensive legislative and administrative overhaul is required. Institutional strengthening cannot be achieved through ad-hoc policy adjustments; it demands structural, legally enforceable changes.

- **Amending Article 243-G for Mandatory Devolution:** The foundational ambiguity within Article 243-G must be rectified. The discretionary "may" must be replaced with a mandatory "shall," legally obligating State Legislatures to devolve all twenty-nine subjects listed in the Eleventh Schedule to the Panchayats. This would provide local bodies with a secure, constitutionally protected functional jurisdiction.
- **Dismantling Institutional Parallelism:** The deliberate practice of bypassing Panchayats through parastatal agencies and independent line departments must be phased out. All centrally sponsored and state-level rural development schemes should be legally routed through the three-tier Panchayat framework, establishing them as the sole planning and executing authorities within their geographic boundaries.
- **Restructuring the Administrative Hierarchy:** The bureaucratic paradigm must shift from control to facilitation. State-appointed executive officers and technical staff should be placed under the direct administrative control, performance evaluation, and disciplinary jurisdiction of the elected Panchayat councils. This horizontal alignment of accountability is vital to dismantling traditional bureaucratic hegemony.

9.3 Achieving Fiscal Autonomy and Self-Reliance

The fundamental weakness of the Panchayati Raj system is its financial vulnerability. True autonomy is impossible without economic independence. Elevating Panchayats beyond a state of fiscal castration requires a complete restructuring of local public finance.

- **Expanding and Enforcing Local Taxation Powers:** States must legally divest lucrative, buoyant tax bases to local bodies. Panchayats should be equipped and legally mandated to levy user charges, property taxes, professional taxes, and commercial fees within their jurisdictions. This will build an independent, reliable revenue stream and reduce their vulnerability to external political shifts.
- **Reforming State Finance Commissions (SFCs):** The appointment and operationalization of SFCs must strictly adhere to the five-year constitutional timeline under Article 243-I. Furthermore, state legislatures should be legally required to table SFC reports within a fixed statutory period, and the recommendations regarding the devolution of net state tax proceeds should carry binding legislative weight.
- **Transitioning from Tied to Untied Grants:** Higher echelons of government must move away from paternalistic, highly restricted "tied grants." Enhancing the proportion of "untied grants" allows Panchayats the budgetary flexibility to allocate resources according to localized, community-driven priorities determined by the Gram Sabha.

9.4 The Judicial Matrix and Federalism: The Missing Jurisprudence on Part IX

A critical gap in the evolution of the Panchayati Raj system is the relative silence of constitutional jurisprudence regarding third-tier federalism. While the Supreme Court of India has extensively developed the doctrine of federalism in relations between the Union and the States—most notably in *S.R. Bommai v. Union of India*—this robust judicial protection has rarely been extended to Panchayats.

The judiciary has historically viewed disputes involving local bodies through the lens of administrative law rather than constitutional law. When state governments arbitrarily dissolve Panchayats, delay local elections, or strip them of functional jurisdiction, courts frequently treat these actions as mere statutory violations rather than direct assaults on the federal structure of the Constitution.

For the Seventy-Third Amendment to achieve its true potential, the judiciary must recognize local self-government as an indispensable component of the "Basic Structure" of the Indian Constitution. Judicial review under Article 226 and Article 32 must be actively deployed to protect the democratic mandate of local councils from executive overreach, establishing local governance as a constitutional right rather than an administrative privilege.

9.5 Global Best Practices: Subsidiarity as a Functional Standard

The structural stagnation of Indian Panchayats stands in sharp contrast to successful models of local self-governance globally. The core principle driving effective decentralization across mature democracies is the Principle of Subsidiarity. This principle dictates that a central authority should only perform tasks that cannot be performed effectively at a more immediate or local level.

- **The European Charter of Local Self-Government:** This framework explicitly mandates that public responsibilities should generally be exercised preferably by those authorities who are closest to the citizens. In countries like Germany and Sweden, local authorities possess guaranteed fiscal sovereignty and handle primary public utilities, law enforcement, and spatial planning.
- **The Brazilian Experience:** Following its 1988 Constitution, Brazil transformed its municipalities into autonomous federative units, placing them on an equal constitutional footing with states and the federal government. This framework directly led to highly successful innovations like participatory budgeting in Porto Alegre, where citizens directly vote on public investment priorities.

By aligning Part IX of the Indian Constitution with international standards of subsidiarity, India can move away from its current paternalistic model and toward a resilient system where the local body acts as the primary site of state action.

9.6 Digital Governance and E-Pragmatism: Opportunities and Pathologies

The contemporary push toward digital public infrastructure offers a dual-edged sword for Panchayati Raj governance. While e-governance applications can enhance transparency, they can also centralize control if poorly implemented.

On one hand, initiatives such as the *e-GramSwaraj* portal, geo-tagging of assets, and direct benefit transfers (DBT) have significantly reduced information asymmetry and cut down traditional rent-seeking behavior by local middle-men. These tools allow Gram Sabhas to access real-time financial tracking, transforming the nature of social audits.

On the other hand, a lack of technical capacity can lead to Digital Bureaucratization. When complex digital compliance mechanisms are mandated without adequate infrastructure or local training, elected representatives are forced to rely on external tech vendors and block-level computer operators. This shifts actual administrative control away from the elected Panchayat and back into the hands of an unelected, technocratic bureaucracy. Digital tools should enhance local autonomy, not serve as modern mechanisms for remote control by state capitals.

9.7 A Comprehensive Policy Matrix for Reform

To move from diagnostic critique to prescriptive action, the structural rejuvenation of Panchayati Raj Institutions requires a coordinated, multi-pronged legislative and policy intervention:

Constitutional and Legislative Reforms

- **A Binding Twelfth Schedule Matrix:** The Eleventh Schedule must be converted from an illustrative menu into a mandatory allocation. A clear legal division of functions must be established to prevent state line departments from encroaching on local jurisdictions.
- **Panchayat Electoral Autonomy:** The State Election Commissions (SECs) must be given the same institutional insulation and independent machinery as the Election Commission of India to completely eliminate political interference in delimitation and election scheduling.

Administrative and Capacity Reforms

- **A Dedicated Local Cadre:** States must establish a specialized, permanent administrative cadre for local governance. Staff within this cadre must be directly recruited by, paid by, and answerable to the Panchayats, breaking the system of vertical bureaucratic loyalty to state departments.
- **Institutional Capacity Building:** State Institutes of Rural Development (SIRDs) must be upgraded to provide ongoing, professionalized training in public finance, data-driven planning, and environmental management for elected representatives.

Fiscal and Budgetary Reforms

- **Compulsory Municipal and Rural Tax Codes:** States must pass statutory frameworks that mandate the collection of specific local taxes, ensuring Panchayats cannot waive revenue collection out of fear of political unpopularity.
- **A Public Finance Management System (PFMS) for PRIs:** Integrating local bodies into a unified, transparent public finance system will allow for the predictable, automated release of untied funds, eliminating long delays caused by state treasuries.

9.8 Epilogue

The constitutional project initiated by Part IX of the Constitution remains unfinished. The Seventy-Third Amendment successfully democratized the *composition* of rural governance, but it failed to democratize the *structure of power*. Panchayats have been given the political legitimacy to represent the people, but they lack the structural authority to serve them effectively.

The transition from a centralized administrative state to a genuinely federal republic requires the Indian state to surrender its paternalistic control over local bodies. Ultimately, institutional strengthening and fiscal independence are not merely technical adjustments; they are profound democratic imperatives. Only when the lowest tier of governance is secured by stable law and financial independence can India claim to be the world's largest—and most deeply rooted—democracy.