

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi-Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Managing Editor of IJLRA. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of IJLRA.

Though every effort has been made to ensure that the information in Volume II Issue 7 is accurate and appropriately cited/referenced, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible in any manner whatsoever for any consequences for any action taken by anyone on the basis of information in the Journal.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis

EDITORIALTEAM

EDITORS

Dr. Samrat Datta

Dr. Samrat Datta Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Samrat Datta is currently associated with Seedling School of Law and Governance, Jaipur National University, Jaipur. Dr. Datta has completed his graduation i.e., B.A.LL.B. from Law College Dehradun, Hemvati Nandan Bahuguna Garhwal University, Srinagar, Uttarakhand. He is an alumnus of KIIT University, Bhubaneswar where he pursued his post-graduation (LL.M.) in Criminal Law and subsequently completed his Ph.D. in Police Law and Information Technology from the Pacific Academy of Higher Education and Research University, Udaipur in 2020. His area of interest and research is Criminal and Police Law. Dr. Datta has a teaching experience of 7 years in various law schools across North India and has held administrative positions like Academic Coordinator, Centre Superintendent for Examinations, Deputy Controller of Examinations, Member of the Proctorial Board



Dr. Namita Jain

Head & Associate Professor

School of Law, JECRC University, Jaipur Ph.D. (Commercial Law) LL.M., UGC -NET Post Graduation Diploma in Taxation law and Practice, Bachelor of Commerce.



Teaching Experience: 12 years, AWARDS AND RECOGNITION of Dr. Namita Jain are - ICF Global Excellence Award 2020 in the category of educationalist by I Can Foundation, India. India Women Empowerment Award in the category of "Emerging Excellence in Academics by Prime Time & Utkrisht Bharat Foundation, New Delhi. (2020). Conferred in FL Book of Top 21 Record Holders in the category of education by Fashion Lifestyle Magazine, New Delhi. (2020). Certificate of Appreciation for organizing and managing the Professional Development Training Program on IPR in Collaboration with Trade Innovations Services, Jaipur on March 14th, 2019

Mrs.S.Kalpana

Assistant professor of Law

Mrs.S.Kalpana, presently Assistant professor of Law, VelTech Rangarajan Dr.Sagunthala R & D Institute of Science and Technology, Avadi. Formerly Assistant professor of Law, Vels University in the year 2019 to 2020, Worked as Guest Faculty, Chennai Dr.Ambedkar Law College, Pudupakkam. Published one book. Published 8Articles in various reputed Law Journals. Conducted 1Moot court competition and participated in nearly 80 National and International seminars and webinars conducted on various subjects of Law. Did ML in Criminal Law and Criminal Justice Administration. 10 paper presentations in various National and International seminars. Attended more than 10 FDP programs. Ph.D. in Law pursuing.



Avinash Kumar



Avinash Kumar has completed his Ph.D. in International Investment Law from the Dept. of Law & Governance, Central University of South Bihar. His research work is on "International Investment Agreement and State's right to regulate Foreign Investment." He qualified UGC-NET and has been selected for the prestigious ICSSR Doctoral Fellowship. He is an alumnus of the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Formerly he has been elected as Students Union President of Law Centre-1, University of Delhi. Moreover, he completed his LL.M. from the University of Delhi (2014-16), dissertation on "Cross-border Merger & Acquisition"; LL.B. from the University of Delhi (2011-14), and B.A. (Hons.) from Maharaja Agrasen College, University of Delhi. He has also obtained P.G. Diploma in IPR from the Indian Society of International Law, New Delhi. He has qualified UGC – NET examination and has been awarded ICSSR – Doctoral Fellowship. He has published six-plus articles and presented 9 plus papers in national and international seminars/conferences. He participated in several workshops on research methodology and teaching and learning.

ABOUT US

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS
ISSN

2582-6433 is an Online Journal is Monthly, Peer Review, Academic Journal, Published online, that seeks to provide an interactive platform for the publication of Short Articles, Long Articles, Book Review, Case Comments, Research Papers, Essay in the field of Law & Multidisciplinary issue. Our aim is to upgrade the level of interaction and discourse about contemporary issues of law. We are eager to become a highly cited academic publication, through quality contributions from students, academics, professionals from the industry, the bar and the bench. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH & ANALYSIS ISSN 2582-6433 welcomes contributions from all legal branches, as long as the work is original, unpublished and is in consonance with the submission guidelines.

CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT WITH RECENT CASES

AUTHORED BY: V.VIDUTHALAI VIRUMBI

B.C.A.LLB, LLM (Pursuing)

INSTITUTION: THE TAMILNADU Dr. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY

CO-AUTHOR: MS.T.VAISHALI

B.A(Eng Lit), LLM., NET.,

PH.D (Pursuing) Assistant Professor of Law

INSTITUTION: THE TAMILNADU Dr. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT

The Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA), 1988, is a cornerstone of India's anti-corruption legal framework, aimed at addressing corrupt practices by public officials. The Act criminalizes bribery, abuse of office, and misuse of public funds by government servants, offering a robust legal remedy for combating corruption. However, despite its good intentions, the Act has faced criticism due to various shortcomings in its implementation, including the procedural complexities, ambiguities in its provisions, and issues regarding the burden of proof. This article critically examines the Prevention of Corruption Act, analyzing its strengths, weaknesses, and recent developments through case law. It also highlights key judicial interpretations that have shaped its application and the challenges in enforcing the Act effectively. Recent amendments enhance its scope by including corporate bribery and setting provisions for protecting whistleblowers, thereby aligning with global anti-corruption standards. The PCA underscores the importance of integrity and reinforces efforts to ensure a corruption-free society.

Keywords: Corruption, Bribery, Anti-corruption laws, Legal framework

INTRODUCTION

The **Prevention of Corruption Act** serves as a cornerstone in India's fight against corruption, aimed at fostering a culture of integrity and accountability in public administration and corporate practices. Corruption, particularly within the public sector, continues to be a significant problem in India. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PCA), seeks to combat corruption among public servants and officials. The Act criminalizes various corrupt practices, including accepting bribes, influencing government decisions through illicit means, and engaging in dishonest conduct. While the Act has been instrumental in curbing corrupt practices, its application and effectiveness remain subjects of debate. The Act has undergone significant amendments, notably in 2018, to broaden its scope and align with global anti-corruption practices. These amendments include the introduction of corporate liability for bribery, clearer definitions of offenses, and provisions for time-bound trials to enhance judicial efficiency. By addressing corruption at various levels, the PCA seeks to uphold the principles of good governance, promote transparency, and build public trust in institutions. The Prevention of Corruption Act remains a cornerstone in India's legal and ethical framework, reflecting the nation's resolve to combat corruption and pave the way for sustainable development and equitable growth. This paper critically analyses the PCA, looking at its provisions, challenges, and recent case laws to evaluate the law's practical application and the judicial perspective on its efficacy.

THE PROVISIONS AND MECHANISMS OF THE PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT 1988

The PCA primarily criminalizes corruption and bribery by public officials and government servants. The provision includes:

1. Section 7: This section makes it an offense for a public servant to accept a bribe for performing a public duty.
2. Section 11: It criminalizes the act of accepting or attempting to accept a bribe, even if the public servant has not yet discharged their duty.
3. Section 13: It includes the criminalization of abuse of power by a public servant, where a public servant misuses their position to obtain a monetary gain or favor.
4. Section 17: Grants powers to law enforcement agencies to arrest public servants involved in corruption-related offenses without prior approval from their respective

departments.¹

While these provisions were designed to strengthen anti-corruption measures, certain limitations have been observed, especially with regard to the complexity of the investigative process and the challenges in obtaining convictions.

MERITS AND DEMERITS OF PREVENTION OF CORRUPTION ACT

MERITS:

1. **Comprehensive Coverage:** The PCA covers a wide range of corrupt activities, from accepting bribes to abusing power for personal gains, thus providing a broad legal mechanism to address corruption.
2. **Public Servant Accountability:** The Act holds public servants accountable for any misconduct related to corruption, which is critical in ensuring transparency in government institutions.
3. **Punitive Measures:** The PCA prescribes stringent penalties, including imprisonment, for those convicted under its provisions.²

DEMERITS:

1. **Proving the Offense:** One of the significant challenges in implementing the **Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA)** is the difficulty of **proving the offense** beyond a reasonable doubt. **Section 20** of the Act plays a crucial role in this, as it **shifts the burden of proof** to the accused, requiring them to justify the source of any unexplained wealth. While this provision is intended to strengthen the prosecution's case, it has faced criticism for creating an imbalance in the legal framework.
2. **Lengthy Trials:** Despite the stringent provisions, the long delays in the judicial process often result in prolonged trials, which can lead to the accused escaping justice due to the slow pace of the legal system.
3. **Need for Prior Sanction:** Under Section 19, prior sanction from the government or relevant authority is required to initiate criminal proceedings against public servants. This provision has been criticized for being a procedural bottleneck that hinders the effective prosecution of corrupt officials.

¹ <https://www.kherkhergarcia.com/what-is-the-survivor-bill-of-rights-act>

² <https://www.scobserver.in/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/Note-2-Overview-of-the-PMLA.pdf>

4. Lack of Protection for Whistleblowers: The PCA does not provide adequate safeguards for individuals who expose corruption. This limits the willingness of potential whistleblowers to come forward due to fear of retaliation.³

RECENT CASE LAW: JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND DEVELOPMENTS

The Supreme Court of India and various High Courts have played an instrumental role in interpreting the PCA and shaping its application. Recent case law highlights both the evolving interpretation of the law and its practical challenges.

1. Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Director, CBI (2014):

It is a landmark judgment by the Supreme Court of India that focused on the issue of **sanction for prosecuting public servants** under the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988**. Dr. Subramanian Swamy filed a petition challenging the provision under **Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988**, which requires prior sanction from the competent authority before prosecuting public servants for corruption-related offenses. He contended that the provision caused unnecessary delays and hindered justice.

Key Issues in the Case:

1. Whether the requirement of prior sanction under Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act is valid?
2. Whether a time limit for granting sanction should be mandated to avoid delays in prosecution?

Judgment by the Supreme Court:

The Supreme Court upheld the validity of Section 19, stating that prior sanction is necessary to protect public servants from frivolous and vexatious litigation. However, it also emphasized the importance of time-bound decision-making to prevent delays in corruption cases.⁴

2. State of Karnataka v. Ameerjan (2021):

A public servant was found to have assets more than his known sources of income. The trial court convicted him, but the High Court acquitted him, citing insufficient evidence.

³ <https://lawbhoomi.com/an-overview-of-prevention-of-corruption-act>

⁴ (2014) 8 SCC 682

Key Issue in the case:

Whether the possession of disproportionate assets by a public servant constitutes criminal misconduct under **Section 13(1)(e)** of the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988**?

The Karnataka High Court in this case observed that a public servant's involvement in corrupt practices should not be assessed lightly. The Court reiterated that even minor acts of corruption by public servants should be punished to uphold public trust.⁵

3. B. R. Ghosh v. State of West Bengal (2015):

B. R. Ghosh, a retired public servant, was accused of corruption. He argued that prosecution required prior sanction under Section 19, even after retirement. Ghosh argued that prosecution required prior sanction under **Section 19 of the PCA**, which mandates approval from the competent authority for prosecuting public servants. He claimed that even as a retired official, sanction was necessary since the alleged offense occurred during his service.⁶

Key Issue in the case:

Whether prior sanction under Section 19 of the PCA is required for prosecuting retired public servants for corruption offenses committed during their tenure?

Judgment by the Supreme Court:

The **Supreme Court ruled** that **prior sanction** under **Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA)** is not required for the prosecution of a **retired public servant**. The Court held that the provision applies only to **serving public servants**, not to those who have already retired from service. The court observed that the purpose of Section 19 is to protect serving public servants from frivolous and vexatious proceedings. However, once a public servant retires, they are no longer entitled to such protection. Since Ghosh was a retired public servant, the requirement of prior sanction did not apply, and he could be prosecuted for his actions during his tenure without the need for approval from any authority.⁷

4. Lokayukta Case (2018):

The case involved a challenge regarding the jurisdiction and powers of the Lokayukta in investigating allegations of corruption against politicians holding high office. A petition was filed by certain officials arguing that the Lokayukta did not have the authority to probe high-ranking officials without the government's prior approval.

⁵ (2021) 4 SCC 691

⁶ <https://blog.ipleaders.in/prevention-of-money-laundering-act-pmla-2002/>

⁷ (2015) 4 SCC 718

Key issues in this case:

Whether the **Lokayukta**, an anti-corruption ombudsman, has the power to investigate allegations of corruption against high-ranking public officials, including the Chief Minister and ministers, under the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988?**

Judgment by the Supreme Court:

The Court ruled that the Lokayukta has constitutional and statutory power to investigate and prosecute public servants, including politicians, for corruption, even without prior sanction from the state government. The Court clarified that while the Lokayukta can investigate the Chief Minister and ministers, prior sanction for prosecution from the concerned authority (such as the Governor) is required before filing charges under the Prevention of Corruption Act. The ruling reinforced the Lokayukta's role in maintaining transparency, integrity, and accountability in governance.⁸

CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION AND REFORM PROPOSALS

The **Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA), 1988** is a crucial tool in combating corruption in India, but its implementation faces several challenges. Below are the key challenges in the implementation of the Act, followed by reform proposals to improve its effectiveness.

CHALLENGES IN IMPLEMENTATION:**1. Delay in Investigation and Prosecution:**

- **Challenge:** Corruption cases often take years to be investigated and prosecuted due to procedural delays and a slow judicial process.
- **Impact:** The prolonged legal battle reduces the effectiveness of the Act, as many accused individuals continue in their positions while cases drag on.

2. Requirement of Prior Sanction:

- **Challenge:** Section 19 of the PCA requires prior sanction from the competent authority (e.g., the government or higher officials) to prosecute public servants. This provision can be misused to delay or prevent prosecution, especially when powerful individuals are involved.

⁸ (2018) 4 SCC 519

- **Impact:** This provision has been criticized for making it difficult to initiate legal proceedings against high-ranking officials.

3. Weaknesses in Enforcement and Investigations:

- **Challenge:** Investigating agencies like the **Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI)** and state anti-corruption bodies often face resource constraints, political pressure, and lack of independence, affecting their ability to conduct impartial and efficient investigations.
- **Impact:** The lack of autonomy in investigative bodies hampers the successful implementation of the Act.

4. Political Influence and Interference:

- **Challenge:** Corruption often involves individuals in high political positions, and there may be political interference in investigations and prosecutions.
- **Impact:** Political influence may result in the weakening of cases or even dismissal of charges, undermining the intent of the PCA.

5. Lack of Whistleblower Protection:

- **Challenge:** Though the **Whistleblowers Protection Act, 2014** was enacted, the absence of comprehensive protection for whistleblowers under the PCA results in a lack of public trust. Individuals who report corruption often face threats, harassment, or retaliation.
- **Impact:** The lack of adequate protection discourages people from coming forward with evidence of corruption.

6. Inadequate Penalties and Loopholes in the Act:

- **Challenge:** The penalties under the PCA may not always be sufficient to deter corruption, and the Act has been criticized for having gaps in its provisions, such as those related to corporate bribery or foreign bribery.
- **Impact:** Corruption continues to flourish as the legal consequences may not be severe enough to act as a deterrent.⁹

⁹ <https://dea.gov.in/sites/default/files/moneylaunderingact.pdf>

REFORM PROPOSALS:

1. Streamlining Investigations and Prosecutions:

- **Proposal:** Establish special **fast-track courts** and dedicated investigative teams to handle corruption cases more efficiently.
- **Expected Outcome:** Expedited trials and investigations would ensure timely justice, making the PCA more effective.

2. Removing the Requirement for Prior Sanction:

- **Proposal:** Amend Section 19 to eliminate the requirement of prior sanction for prosecuting public servants in cases involving serious corruption or allow for automatic prosecution after a reasonable period of time (e.g., 6 months).
- **Expected Outcome:** This would reduce delays caused by political interference and speed up the process of prosecuting corrupt officials.

3. Strengthening Investigative Agencies:

- **Proposal:** Increase the **autonomy and resources** of anti-corruption agencies like the CBI and state anti-corruption bureaus. These bodies should be shielded from political pressure and given sufficient manpower and technology for efficient investigations.
- **Expected Outcome:** An independent and well-resourced investigative body would enhance the PCA's effectiveness in combating corruption.

4. Introduction of Corporate Liability:

- **Proposal:** Amend the PCA to include **corporate liability** for corruption, specifically targeting **bribery by corporations**. Provisions should also cover **foreign bribery** (bribing officials in other countries to gain business advantages).
- **Expected Outcome:** Holding corporations accountable for corrupt practices would reduce the corporate bribery culture and increase transparency.

5. Enhanced Whistleblower Protection:

- **Proposal:** Strengthen provisions under the **Whistleblowers Protection Act**, including better confidentiality measures, compensation for those who face retaliation, and greater transparency in handling complaints.
- **Expected Outcome:** A robust whistleblower protection mechanism would encourage more people to report corruption, contributing to greater accountability.¹⁰

CONCLUSION

The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 has played a critical role in India's efforts to combat corruption, providing a legal framework to penalize corrupt practices within both public and private sectors. However, its implementation faces several challenges, such as delays in investigations and prosecutions, political interference, the cumbersome requirement of prior sanction, and inadequate protection for whistleblowers. These challenges have often hindered the effective enforcement of the Act, undermining its potential to curb corruption.

The judicial precedents, such as **Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Director, CBI (2014)** and **State of Karnataka v. Ameerjan (2021)**, have emphasized the need for a robust legal framework that balances transparency with protection against wrongful allegations. Similarly, the **Lokayukta Case (2018)** reinforced the idea that anti-corruption bodies must be empowered to hold even high-ranking officials accountable.

To enhance the effectiveness of the Prevention of Corruption Act, significant reforms are needed. Proposals such as the removal of the prior sanction requirement, strengthening investigative agencies, increasing corporate liability, and providing better protection for whistleblowers can address many of the challenges currently impeding progress. Additionally, ensuring stricter penalties for corruption and expediting trials can create a stronger deterrent against corrupt practices.

Ultimately, while the Prevention of Corruption Act remains a powerful tool against corruption, its success depends on timely reforms, effective implementation, and a commitment to upholding the principles of accountability and transparency across all levels of governance. A comprehensive approach that includes legal, procedural, and societal changes will be crucial in ensuring that the fight against corruption in India is both sustained and successful.

¹⁰ <https://www.jkshahclasses.com/announcement/PMLA.pdf>