INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA).*

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

ISSN: 2582-6433

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

SECTION 17A PROTECTION OF CORRUPTION ACT, 1988: PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARD OR STRUCTURAL SUBVERSION?

AUTHORED BY - YAJAS DINESH SINGH
Jindal Global Law School (2nd Year)
BA. LLB (Hons)

Background

In July 2018 the Indian Parliament inserted Section 17A into the Prevention of Corruption Act (PCA), 1988.[1] In plain terms, the provision "bars any enquiry or inquiry or investigation" into an alleged offence by a public servant – if that offence is connected to any official recommendation or decision, unless prior approval is obtained from the competent authority .[2] The competent authority refers to the Central government for public servants employed under the Union, and State governments for ones employed under the state.

The PCA already required government approval for prosecution of a public servant (Section 19),[3] akin to Section 197 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. Until 2018 however, no sanction was needed merely to investigate a corruption allegation. By contrast, Section 17A introduced in 2018 by the PCA Amendment Act demands prior approval even for inquiries or investigations into alleged offences "relatable to any recommendation made or decision taken" by the officer in discharge of duty.[4]

The 'competent authority' must then decide within three months (extendable by one month).[6] The stated objective to Section 17a is to prevent harassment of officials who make bona fide decisions. It applies across the board to central and state public servants; notably, it excludes trap cases (where an officer is caught red-handed taking a bribe), and focuses on acts "in discharge of official duties".[7]

I believe that while the intent behind Section 17A may have been genuine: to protect upright officers from vindictive complaints, its wording is blunt and unconditional. No preliminary inquiry can proceed without sanction. In effect, Section 17A re-enacts the infamous "Single Directive" ruled void in Vineet Narain v. Union of India (1997), which had similarly barred

ISSN: 2582-6433

investigation of senior officials without Central sanction.[8] In fact, as the Court observed, Section 17A is "an attempt to resurrect" the very scheme struck down in Vineet Narain.[9] By recalling those precedents, the Bench singled that a prior-approval regime is constitutionally suspect.

The 'Centre for Public Interest Litigation 'PIL

In a recent Supreme Court case an NGO named CPIL challenged Section 17A as unconstitutional.[10] Its petition (filed under Article 32) argued that the provision contravened the Act's object, Article 14, and binding precedents. For example, it was pointed out that governments almost never grant sanction to investigate their own officers. As lawyer for the plaintiff, Mr. Bhushan argued, Section 17A had "crippled the anti-corruption law", because practically speaking, the competent authority (the executive itself) would hardly permit any inquiry .[11] A two-judge bench (Nagarathna and K.V Viswanathan) delivered its ruling on 13 January 2026.[12] It was split. Given this impasse, the matter has now been referred to CJI Surya Kant for a larger bench hearing.[13]

Justice Nagarathna's view found Section 17A "plainly unconstitutional."[14] In her view, it is fundamentally at odds with the Act's purpose. Quoting her language, "the requirement of prior approval … is contrary to the object and purpose of the Act, in as much as it forestalls an enquiry and thereby in substance protects the corrupt rather than seeking to protect the honest".[15] In other words, needing permission even to investigate means that a corrupt officer (especially a senior one) can evade scrutiny entirely, while only the honest are served by such a provision. Nagarathna J. decried the sharp classification: protection extends only to officials who make decisions; junior functionaries or non-decision-makers get no shield. Such selective protection, she found, violates the guarantee of equality (Article 14), since it classifies public servants into a narrow class without rational basis.[16] It was also rightfully emphasised that previous rulings (like Vineet Narain and Subramanian Swamy) had already invalidated similar prior-sanction regimes.[17] Thus, in her view, adding Section 17A was essentially judicially foreclosed by binding precedent.[18]

In sharp contrast, Justice Viswanathan believed the provision was not inherently unconstitutional.[19] He saw Section 17A's "singular object" as a laudable one: protecting honest public servants from "frivolous and vexatious" probes, thereby avoiding policy paralysis .[20] He argued that barring any investigation at the threshold is, at worst, a procedural safeguard that

ISSN: 2582-6433

can be balanced with other rights. Importantly, he noted that nowhere does Section 17A provide a mechanism for review; hence he suggested an independent screening step (via the Lokpal or Lokayukta) for deciding sanction.[21] In his words, "the singular object is to protect bona fide recommendations and decisions".[22] He warned that striking down the section entirely would be like "throwing the baby out with the bathwater," leaving honest officers exposed to baseless allegations .[23] He also quoted a line from the Bhagavad Gita to emphasize that even being dragged through a public trial (before acquittal) could irreparably harm a bureaucrat's reputation, suggesting sensitivity to the accused's dignity [24] (though I find that example somewhat tangential to constitutional reasoning).

Analysis

Protection vs. Hindrance: On balance, I believe Nagarathna J.'s critique carries more weight. Naturally, I sympathies with an honest official who makes a legitimate tough call and then faces malicious prosecution. The State surely has an interest in safeguarding civil servants from bona fide administrative decisions being second-guessed in police stations. However, the surgical precision of Section 17A is wanting. It bars all investigations at the outset, even to verify whether a complaint has any substance. Nagarathna pointed out that if preliminary inquiries are blocked, the genuineness of the complaint would not be known.[25] In practice, this means a suspect can continue performing official functions with impunity until the executive permits a probe. Empirically, one must ask: has the executive ever been eager to sanction probes of its own ministers or top bureaucrats? If not, then the provision indeed forecloses inquiry,[26] effectively neutering the Act's enforcement arm. Thus, requiring sanction before even verifying a prima facie case seems to throw open the gates of impunity under the excuse of protecting honest intent.

Secondly, is my argument pertaining to Article 14 (Right to Equality). Section 17A applies only when the alleged offence is tied to an official recommendation or decision. This means ordinary bribery (e.g. an official taking cash)* is unaffected, but if the misdeed involves policy decisions or influence, the officer enjoys a privilege. Hence, only a select class of decision-makers gets this shield.[27] That classification is not obviously justified by any reasonable nexus to the provision's aim: arguably, subordinates can also make decisions or give approvals that could be corrupt, but they are not protected. Why should a junior official be treated differently from a joint secretary, if both are accused of corruption in the line of duty? I believe that discrepancy is constitutionally suspect. Viswanathan dismissed the Article 14 challenge, but

ISSN: 2582-6433

noted that Section 17A could only pass muster if applied uniformly (no discriminatory classification).[28] In reality, the statute itself creates this inequality. Unless the larger bench somehow stitches in equal application (e.g. making it apply to all levels) it seems problematic to me to sustain the law under Article 14.

Beyond equality, there is the broader principle of the rule of law: criminal offences typically cannot be so easily foreclosed by executive fiat. The Supreme Court has repeatedly emphasised the need for investigating agencies to function without arbitrary constraints.[29] In Vineet Narain (1997), the Court struck down a government order requiring sanction to investigate senior officers, citing Article 14 and the need for independent probe.[30] In Subramanian Swamy (2016), the Court held that no sanction is needed at the stage of starting an inquiry (only at trial) under the PCA.[31] These cases stand for the proposition that anticorruption investigations cannot be bottled up by procedural bars. Section 17A, in effect, resurrects the very regime those rulings struck down. I do not think those precedents can be ignored. Justice Viswanathan argued that since Section 17A is a "non-discriminatory statutory enactment," it does not violate Article 14 .[32] But he may be forgetting over that it in practice is discriminatory and that simply codifying an old arbitrary school of thought wouldn't turn it right. A textual remedy (invoking the Lokpal/Lokayukta as sanctioning authority) would amount to judicial legislation, which the Court cannot do.[33]

Viswanathan's concern about "policy paralysis" resonates: no administrator should feel that honest decisions will automatically invite criminal scrutiny years later. I share that concern. But I think the answer lies more in post-facto safeguards, not pre-emptive ones. For instance, good administrative practice and internal vigilance might address the fear of vexatious complaints without derailing corruption probes. Moreover, Section 17A itself already limits scope: it excludes trap cases and applies only to acts "relatable to any recommendation or decision." One might argue that ordinary corruption (e.g. taking a bribe) should also be open to immediate investigation. Even then, keeping the investigatory arms inactive until sanction seems like buying moral risk. It would be wiser to let investigators follow the trail and justify any complaint in court, rather than handcuff them at the door.

At the sake of repetition, a point worth contemplating is that the competent authority is typically the government (Union or State) that appointed the officer.[34] So frankly, we are asking an accused officer's boss to decide if and when the police can look into the officer's conduct. As

ISSN: 2582-6433

Mr. Bhushan argued, sanctions are "not usually forthcoming" from the government.[35] This creates a clear conflict of interest. Viswanathan recognised this by suggesting the Lokpal/Lokayukta step in.[36] He is of the view that transplanting review to an "independent authority" could cure the vice. That remedy sounds sensible, but again, is not in the statute. It seems unlikely the government will voluntarily delegate this power, and courts cannot rewrite the law. My view is that if an independent body is indeed necessary to make Section 17A workable, then perhaps the entire scheme should be legislatively amended rather than left to judicial patchwork.

Executive Protection vs. Anti-Corruption Enforcement: One delicate balance here is between protecting honest public servants and ensuring corrupt ones face justice. In theory those goals can coincide: a screening mechanism would prevent truly baseless probes while allowing meritorious ones. In practice, however, investigations often hinge on building evidence, and any fixed barrier at the outset can prevent that from happening. I believe the pendulum has swung too far towards precaution. The very ethos of the anti-corruption law (reinforced by constitutional spirit) is to deter abuse of public office. Having to ask permission every time undermines that ethos. The honest therefore don't really require legal armour, what they need is due process – whereas the corrupt benefit disproportionately from quashing inquiries at the threshold .[37] This reversal is troubling.

In sum, while Section 17A's aim was understandable, its implementation is flawed. A kinder provision might have framed the prior sanction as permissive guidance or required post-facto justification rather than an absolute block on any enquiry. Requiring sanction after recording some evidence (like an independent preliminary inquiry) could have achieved the same policy aim without nullifying the first, critical step of detection. Instead, the current wording risks becoming a safe haven for those high-level bureaucrats and politicians who are often precisely the ones critics worry about.

Conclusion

I believe the Supreme Court's split decision correctly reflected the tension between two worthy objectives and exposed the problematic design of Section 17A. Justice Nagarathna's stance – that the law in its present form "protects the corrupt" by making investigations practically impossible – appears prescient .[38] At the same time, Justice Viswanathan's sympathy for honest officers is not misplaced, though I doubt the legislative response should be to neuter anti-

ISSN: 2582-6433

corruption enforcement. Ultimately, I lean with the view that a pre-investigation sanction requirement is unconstitutional and thus, bad policy. If anything, the State should clarify its criteria for sanction so that investigators are not left paralyzed by default.

If the larger bench upholds Section 17A, I hope it will at least mandate clear, strict guidelines on how and when approval is granted, ideally with an independent element (perhaps recalling Viswanathan J.'s Lokpal/Lokayukta idea). On the other hand, if Section 17A is struck down, the legislature could still address genuine concerns of frivolous complaints by other means – for example, by setting a reasonable process for initiating trivial allegation inquiries without full police powers. But as matters stand, I concur with the criticism that Section 17A, as drafted, overshoots its mark and undermines the Act'score promise of "probity in public life".[39] The ongoing debate will rightly centre on recalibrating this balance, to ensure our anti-corruption laws empower investigators to act when they should, without unnecessarily chilling earnest governance.

*- *This is to clarify that I do not imply trap cases. I am talking about instances where public servants are simply accused of bribery, not relating to a broader decision of office duty.*

Citations

1. The Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018, No. 16 of 2018 (India).
2. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, No. 49 of 1988, § 17A (India) (as inserted by Act 16 of 2018).
3. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, No. 49 of 1988, § 19 (India).
4. Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, No. 2 of 1974, § 197 (India).
5. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, § 17A(1) (India).
6. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, § 17A(1) provisos (India) (approval period of three months, extendable by one month).
7. The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, § 17A proviso (India) (exception where a person is arrested on the spot for accepting or attempting to accept undue advantage).
8. Vineet Narain v. Union of India, (1998) 1 SCC 226 (India).
9. Dr. Subramanian Swamy v. Director, Central Bureau of Investigation, (2014) 8 SCC 682 (India) (striking down DSPE Act § 6A as unconstitutional).
10. India Const. art. 32.
11. India Const. art. 14.

ISSN: 2582-6433

12. Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, No. 1 of 2014 (India).
13. Supreme Court Delivers Split Verdict on Validity of Prevention of Corruption Act Section 17A, Prasar Bharati (News on AIR) (Jan. 14, 2026), https://newsonair.gov.in.
14. SC Delivers Split Verdict on Section 17A of Prevention of Corruption Act, The Economic Times (ET LegalWorld / PTI) (Jan. 13, 2026), https://legal.economictimes.indiatimes.com.
15. Supreme Court Delivers Split Verdict on Prior Approval Clause in Anti-Graft Law, The Indian Express (Jan. 14, 2026), https://indianexpress.com.
16. 'Protecting the Corrupt 'v. 'Shielding Honest Public Servants': Supreme Court's Split Verdict on 17A PCA, The Wire (Jan. 13, 2026), https://thewire.in.
17. Section 17A of PCA: Supreme Court Delivers Split Verdict; What the Two Judges Said, The Times of India (Jan. 13, 2026), https://timesofindia.indiatimes.com.
18. Vineet Narain v. Union of India — Jain Hawala Background and SC Directions (contextual reference), Supreme Court Cases / SCC Online headnotes (case summary), (India). (Use SCC Online / SCC headnote citation if you have access; otherwise omit.)
19. Centre for Public Interest Litigation (CPIL), Public Interest Petition challenging Section 17A PCA, Supreme Court of India, Writ Petition (Civil) under Art. 32 (case details as reported in sources cited above).