

**Report of enquiry into the specific instance of EVM malfunctioning mentioned in Chapter of “Faulty Voting Machines Cause Tampering Concern” of the Book-Democracy at Risk- written by Sh. GVL Narasimha Rao**

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 52)</b></p> PC Name: Gautambudh Nagar AC Name: Noida Booth No. 61 Total votes polled: 417 Anil Kumar (Independent)- 247 Sher Singh (Independent)- 153 Rishi Singh (Independent)- 9 Other Independents- 6 Mahesh Sharma (BJP)- 1 Samajwadi Pary- 1 Writer has contacted over 100 voters in the polling station area who categorically stated that they have neither voted for any of these ‘independent’ candidates nor have they even heard of them. Many voters recalled that the voting machine had malfunctioned for half an hour and this could have resulted in this fake outcome.	No such complaint was received by the Returning Officer, Sector Magistrate or any other officials of the Commission. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 52)</b></p> PC Name: Ghaziabad AC Name- 54- Muradnagar Booth No. 247 Total votes polled: 501 Satish (Independent)- 501 Congress candidate- 0 BJP candidate- 0 BSP candidate- 1 Local enquiries revealed that the candidate in question does not belong to that area and nobody in the area seemed to know him, let alone vote for him.	DEO, Ghaziabad has reported that in polling station no. 247:- Total votes polled: 685 Out of 685 votes- BSP- 1 BJP- 0 INC- 0 IJI- 0 NBNP- 1 NLHP- 0 NELU-0 ABHM- 0 BPD-1 T.S. Sharma (IND)- 1 Daya (IND)- 0 Yatan Sharma- 1 Lal Singh (IND)- 3 Vinod (IND)- 169 Satish (IND)- 501 Samar Singh (IND)- 7  It is observed from the nomination filed by Sh. Satish that his address is 196 Kallupura, Ghaziabad and his name is in the voter list of P.S. No. 250 of54- Muradnagar <b>The allegation is false.</b>

Name of State/UT	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<p><b>Puducherry</b></p>	<p>(page no. 48)</p> <p>PC Name: Puducherry  PS No. 6 of Ozhukarai A.S.  All 555 votes were discarded as the Control Unit malfunctioned on the day of counting..</p>	<p>It is a fact that votes in the EVM of P.S.No. 6 of Ozhukarai Assembly Segment of Puducherry could not be counted because of a fault in the EVM. Since 555 votes were polled in this Polling Station and the margin of votes between the winning candidate and the first runner up candidate was 91,772 votes, result was declared. It is standard practice of the Commission that in cases where votes of an EVM can not be counted because of a fault in the EVM, results are declared without counting that EVM, if the margin of votes between the winner and first runner up is more than the votes polled in that polling station. In those cases where the margin of votes is less the result of that EVM is seen either using an Auxiliary Display Unit (ADU) or the result is printed out using a printer. Result was printed out in this manner from the EVM pertaining to the Polling Station No.97 of 131-Fakharpur Assembly Constituency in General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, 2007. <b>The comments in the book are misleading.</b></p>

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<p><b>Orissa</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 46)</b></p> <p>1. Alleged that in the Lok Sabha poll which went on 16<sup>th</sup> April and 22<sup>nd</sup> April, 2009, voting was delayed in a number of polling stations across the state due to faulty EVMs.</p>	<p>It is standard practice of the Commission that mock poll is done in every polling station in the presence of polling agents of candidates before the actual poll. EVM found defective during the mock poll or during poll, are replaced immediately.</p> <p>In Odisha, according to the report of the Chief Electoral Officer out of 63,234 EVM deployed in election, 188 Control Units and 137 Ballot Units were found defective during the mock poll/poll were replaced. This did not delay the polling.</p> <p><b>The allegation is baseless.</b></p>
	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 46)</b></p> <p>2. Congress and BJP supporters alleged that the EVMs did not record votes in favour of the candidate whichever they choose. Alleged that votes were recorded in favour of Biju Janta Dal.</p>	<p>Only Congress had complained that in Bari Assembly Constituency Booth No. 151 and 152 it is detected that, in touching the bottom of “Hand” symbol it is counted in symbol “Sankha” and in touching “Hand” bottom thrice it is counted one. This was inquired by DEO and Collector , Jajpur and it was found that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ EVMs used in both these polling stations were not faulty nor were they replaced.</li> <li>➤ The complaint that on touching the ‘symbol hand’ on the ballot unit, the vote was registered under the symbol ‘Conch’ was found to be false.</li> </ul> <p><b>The allegation is false.</b></p>
	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 47)</b></p> <p>3. Alleged that many voters had gone back from the booths and the days last information from CEO had put the polling percentage at 52.6%. But on 17<sup>th</sup> April, the percentage was finally placed at 65.9%. This enhancement was attributed to casting of votes beyond the voting time as that was allowed to compensate time lost due to defect in EVMs.</p>	<p>Poll percentage figures reported on the poll day are only approximate figures as it is not possible to get accurate information about poll percentage on the day of the poll from remote naxal affected areas. Actual poll percentage is known only after all polling parties return.</p> <p>It may also be noted that it is standard practice that all voters who have come to the polling station at the time of closing of poll, are allowed to vote however long it may take. In Odisha on 16<sup>th</sup> April, 2009 poll continued after the time of closure of poll in some polling stations as many people had turned up around the time of close of poll. This was not to compensate for any time lost or any defect in EVMs.</p> <p><b>The allegation is false.</b></p>
	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 47)</b></p> <p>4. Voters in a Cuttack booth have manhandled the polling staff suspecting tampering of the EVMs. Apolitical intellectuals feel that there should be credible inquiry over non functioning of EVMs as all the EVMs were checked and verified by the engineers before deployment in the elections. This disproved the Election Commission’s claims that the EVMs are fail-safe and tamper proof.</p>	<p>No polling booth has been specifically mentioned in the book. However, fresh poll was held in Polling Station No. 160 Nimasahi of 90- Barabati Cuttack Assembly Constituency of 14-Cuttack Parliamentary Constituency, where poll was interrupted for some hours as some switches had gone defunct in the Ballot Unit of the EVM. On receiving the complaint the Additional D.M. went to the polling station alongwith an engineer of the BEL to investigate the matter and replaced the EVM. It was noticed that 308 votes were recorded by 2.30 P.M. However some miscreants created problem outside the polling station and the poll was interrupted. Hence the Commission ordered repoll in that polling station.</p> <p><b>The allegation is therefore absurd.</b></p>

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer														
<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 48)</b></p> Parlal Assembly Constituency P.S. Nos.: 185, 197, 209, 212, 221 & 224 All the votes cast in the Control Units have been lost.	<p>This is not factually correct because in all the six polling stations in Parkal Assembly Constituency votes have been cast and counted. The details are as follows.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>P.S.No.</td> <td>Total votes polled</td> </tr> <tr> <td>185</td> <td>934</td> </tr> <tr> <td>197</td> <td>566</td> </tr> <tr> <td>209</td> <td>806</td> </tr> <tr> <td>212</td> <td>594</td> </tr> <tr> <td>221</td> <td>733</td> </tr> <tr> <td>224</td> <td>804</td> </tr> </table> <p><b>The allegation is baseless.</b></p>	P.S.No.	Total votes polled	185	934	197	566	209	806	212	594	221	733	224	804
P.S.No.	Total votes polled															
185	934															
197	566															
209	806															
212	594															
221	733															
224	804															
	Ramagundam Assembly Constituency P.S.No.: 60 & 61. All the votes cast in the Control Units have been lost.	<p>The voters belonging to P.S.No.: 60 &amp; 61 of Ramagundam Assembly Constituency had migrated to P.K. Ramayya colony and therefore, the voters of the aforesaid polling stations were included in polling station No.47. Since, the two polling stations 60 and 61 had no voters, both the polling stations were deleted from the list of polling stations before General Elections. Polling Stations number 60 &amp; 61 did not exist physically. Since these two polling stations have been deleted, the author seems to have come to the conclusion that the votes recorded at these polling stations were not counted.</p> <p><b>The allegation is absurd.</b></p>														
	Panyam Assembly Constituency P.S.No.: 44 & 45. All the votes cast in the Control Units have been lost.	<p>The voters boycotted the poll and therefore no votes were recorded.</p> <p><b>The allegation is baseless.</b></p>														
	Alampur (SC) Assembly Constituency P.S.No.: 60 & 69. All the votes cast in the Control Units have been lost.	<p>The voters boycotted the poll and therefore no votes were recorded.</p> <p><b>The allegation is baseless.</b></p>														

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer																																
<p><b>Andhra Pradesh</b></p>	<p>(page no. 49) Pedakurapadu Assembly Constituency In Nagireddypalem Village The Control Unit was replaced in polling station No.2 as the EVM malfunctioned. 122 votes polled in the replaced EVM were discarded.</p>	<p>It is a fact that votes in the EVM of P.S.No. 2 of Pedakurapadu Assembly Constituency could not be counted because of a fault in the EVM. Since 120 votes were polled in this Polling Station and the margin of votes between the winner and the first runner up candidate was 1607 votes, result was declared. It is standard practice of the Commission that in cases where votes of an EVM can not be counted because of a fault in the EVM, results are declared without counting that EVM, if the margin of votes between the winner and first runner up is more than the votes polled in that polling station. In those cases where the margin of votes is less the result of that EVM is seen either using an Auxiliary Display Unit (ADU) or the result is printed out using a printer. Result was printed out in this manner from the EVM pertaining to the Polling Station No.97 of 131-Fakharapur Assembly Constituency in General Election to Uttar Pradesh Legislative Assembly, 2007. <b>The allegation is false.</b></p>																																
	<p>Uravakonda Assembly 120 votes polled till the first EVM developed a problem were discarded.</p>	<p>The statement does not specify the polling station numbers. Collector, Anantapur has reported that in 5 polling Stations (No. 31 to 35) of 268 Uravakonda A.C., a group of people entered the booths at 9.30 am on 23/4/2009 and forcibly took away the EVMs and destroyed them. There was no instance of malfunctioning of any EVM. Since the miscreants damaged the EVMs in these 5 polling stations, repoll was conducted as per the directions of the Commission without any incidents. <b>The allegation is false.</b></p>																																
	<p>A curious case of vote switching happened in polling station number 73 in Rellivalasa village of Vizianagaram P.C. In this polling station, the Congress candidate had secured only 11 votes in the Lok Sabha election and in the assembly election, the TDP had secured only 10 votes. Both these are highly improbable as these are the principal parties in the State. The unlikely beneficiaries are the BJP in Lok Sabha Election, which secured 319 votes (against only 3 votes in assembly) and the BSP in assembly with 115 votes against 7 votes in Lok Sabha.</p>	<p>This is not born out by the facts. The following table indicates the votes polled in polling station no. 73 in 137-Vizianagaram A.C. of 20-Vizianagaram P.C. in simultaneous elections to Lok Sabha and State Legislative Assembly: -</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="943 1272 1503 1560"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Lok Sabha Election</th> <th colspan="2">State Election</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Party</th> <th>Votes polled</th> <th>Party</th> <th>Votes polled</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>TDP</td> <td>110</td> <td>TDP</td> <td>108</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BJP</td> <td>5</td> <td>BJP</td> <td>4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>INC</td> <td>187</td> <td>INC</td> <td>200</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RJD</td> <td>No cand.</td> <td>RJD</td> <td>1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>BSP</td> <td>0</td> <td>BSP</td> <td>2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PRP</td> <td>151</td> <td>PRP</td> <td>143</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It can be very clearly seen that the number quoted by the author are factually incorrect. In fact, if one sees the entire result sheet for the constituency, both for A.C. as well as P.C., there is not a single polling station which shows result which is remarkable and is any way a significant deviation from the general voting trend of voting. The principle parties like INC, TDP and PRP have consistently been getting the maximum number of votes, whereas other parties and independents have secured very small number of voter usually in single digit. <b>The allegation is absurd.</b></p>	Lok Sabha Election		State Election		Party	Votes polled	Party	Votes polled	TDP	110	TDP	108	BJP	5	BJP	4	INC	187	INC	200	RJD	No cand.	RJD	1	BSP	0	BSP	2	PRP	151	PRP	143
Lok Sabha Election		State Election																																
Party	Votes polled	Party	Votes polled																															
TDP	110	TDP	108																															
BJP	5	BJP	4																															
INC	187	INC	200																															
RJD	No cand.	RJD	1																															
BSP	0	BSP	2																															
PRP	151	PRP	143																															

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<p><b>Maharashtra</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>(page no. 51 &amp; 52)</b></p> <p>In the elections held to Maharashtra Assembly in October, 2009</p> <p>The discrepancy in the actual figures of polling and shown by the EVMs on the counting day has raised doubt in two assembly constituencies in Gondia district- Tiroda and Arjuni-Margaon.</p> <p>According to official figures of voting which were made available to the media on October 14, and the figures shown by EVMs did not tally. There were some discrepancies in the figures of voting on date of counting in Tiroda and Arjuni-Morgaon. The issue has gained importance as the difference in the top two candidates was 623 votes.</p> <p>According to figures given on October 14 out of 1,97,696 voters 1,42,700 cast their franchise, whereas on the October 22, the EVM figure showed 1,43,056. The difference was of 356 votes. These votes could have made a lot of difference in final tally. However, as the difference of the votes between both candidates was over 500, recounting was rejected.</p> <p>In Arjuni-Morgaon out of 2,02,556 voters, 1,49,061 exercised.</p>	<p>The report received from the Chief Electoral Officer, Maharashtra indicates that there were no discrepancies in the figures of votes recorded in Form 17C by Presiding Officers on 13<sup>th</sup> October, 2009 and votes counted on EVMs on 22<sup>nd</sup> October, 2009. The reports clearly indicate that the news report carried by Times of India on 25<sup>th</sup> October, 2009 was based on incorrect information and it is evident that grossly erroneous inferences have been made by Sh. GVL Narasimha Rao in his book entitled "Democracy at Risk" regarding malfunctioning of EVMs during the General Elections to Maharashtra Legislative Assembly, 2009.</p> <p><b>The allegation is baseless and absurd.</b></p>

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	(page no. 45) PC Name: Perambalur AC Name: Manachanallur AIADMK supporters complained that the light flashed against the DMK symbol when they pressed the AIADMK button.	No such complaint was received during the poll day. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Villupuram AC Names: Keezhappalayam, Namachivapuram, Melur, Thagamtheerthapuram, Karunguzhi AIADMK supporters complained that the light flashed against the DMK symbol when they pressed the AIADMK button.	The four village polling stations mentioned in the article falls under 14-Kallakurich P.C. and one under 13-Vilppuram P.C. No such complaints received. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Coimbatore AC Name: Singanallur PS No. 49 in the city, 13 & 14 AIADMK supporters complained that the light flashed against the DMK symbol when they pressed the AIADMK button.	All these EVMs pertaining to the polling stations mentioned were brought to Chennai and examined by the technicians. No such complaints. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Perambalur AC Name: Veppanthattai Light did not flash after vote was cast in the EVM.	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO.</b> <b>The allegation is baseless.</b>
	PC Name: Thnjavur AS Name: Mannargudi PS No. 162 Light did not flash after vote was cast in the EVM.	There was no such incident happened on poll day. <b>The allegation is absurd.</b>
	PC Name: Mayiladuthurai AC Name: Tandamhottam & Tirunarayur EVM did not produce beep sound raising suspicions.	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO.</b> <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Mayiladuthurai AC Name: Vilandakandam Panchayat & Cholanmaligai Button got stuck and did not function	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO.</b> <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Papanasam AC Name: Ayyampetai & Ammapetai Button got stuck and did not function	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO.</b> <b>The allegation is baseless.</b>
	PC Name: Thanjavur AC Name: Senthalai & Nagathi Button got stuck and did not function	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO.</b> <b>The allegation is false.</b>

Name of State	EVM malfunction mentioned in the Book	Report of Chief Electoral Officer
<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	PC Name: Mayiladuthurai AC Name: Darasuram, Kumbakonam P.S.No. 99 The voting machine did not make beep sound after casting the vote.	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO. The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Papanasam AC Name: 158-Keelakovil, 179- Vilayapetai, 180-Tiruvalanchuli and 183- Sundaraperumalkovil. The voting machine did not make beep sound after casting the vote.	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO. The allegation is false.</b>
	PC Name: Coimbatore AC Name: Coimbatore North, P.S.No.: 43, 47 The voting machine did not make beep sound after casting the vote.	No such complaints were received by the Election Official. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	<b>(page nos. 45-46)</b> PC Name: Coimbatore AC Name: Singanallur PS Nos. 38, 165, 52, 150, 2, 13 & 29. Multiple beeps were produced by the EVMs, but ignored by officials.	All these EVMs pertaining to the polling stations mentioned were brought to Chennai and examined by the technicians. No such complaints received. <b>The allegation is baseless.</b>
	PC Name: Coimbatore AC Name: Coimbatore North, PS Nos: 1 & 3 Multiple beeps were produced by the EVMs, but ignored by officials.	No such complaints were reported by the Presiding Officer or by the political parties. <b>The allegation is baseless.</b>
	PC Name: Pollachi PS No.: 92 Multiple beeps were produced by the EVMs, but ignored by officials.	<b>No complaints regarding these incidents received by DEO/RO or ARO. The allegation is baseless.</b>
	Trichy West Assembly Constituency Ward No. 51, Polling Station No. 66A Two paper seals (Nos. 15AA017514 & 15AA017515 found to be damaged)	No such incident occurred nor any complaint received. <b>The allegation is false.</b>
	<b>(page no. 49)</b> In Tiruchirapalli city, in ward number 36 and polling station no. 96, 289 votes were lost which were cast until 11.30 a.m. in the morning when the voting machine was replaced.	During the poll day 418 votes were polled in the said polling station. Out of 418 votes polled in the Control Unit bearing No. C84331 became defective as suddenly the beep sound was not audible (midway) during the poll and the same was replaced by another Control Unit in which 129 votes were polled. During counting, 289 votes polled in the first machine could not be retrieved as the display unit of this Control Unit also got failed and 129 votes polled in the second machine were taken into account for counting. Since the margin was high, result was declared. It is standard practice of the Commission that in cases where votes of an EVM can not be counted because of a fault in the EVM, results are declared without counting that EVM, if the margin of votes between the winner and the first runner up candidate is more than the votes polled in that polling station.
	In Coimbatore P.C., votes were lost in the following polling stations: PS No. 38 (ward number 2) PS No. 149 (ward number 12) PS No. 25 (ward number 19) PS No. 34 (ward number 58) PS No. 55 (ward number 61)	The Chief Electoral Officer has reported that these complaints are not true. <b>The allegation is false.</b>

