Prevention of Corruption Act: Addressing Judicial Delays, Institutional Gaps and Ethical Challenges in India's Anti-Corruption Framework

Published On: 07-09-2026

Recent Developments:

- The **Central Vigilance Commission (CVC)** has highlighted delays in the disposal of corruption cases investigated by the **Central Bureaof Investigation (CBI)**, with **7,229 cases** registered under the **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988** pending trial as of **31 December 2025**.
- Of these pending cases, **2,447 cases** had remained pending for more than 10 years and up to 20 years, while **409 cases** had remained pending for more than 20 years, highlighting the serious problem of delayed justice in corruption-related prosecutions.
- The CVC has also reported that corruption cases pending before higher courts, including appeals, revisions and writ petitions, constitute an additional layer of delay, thereby weakening the deterrent effect of anti-corruption legislation.
- The issue is significant because effective anti-corruption governance requires not only stringent laws but also **swift investigation, timely prosecution, institutional independence, transparency and ethical public administration**.

Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988: Constitutional and Legislative Context:

Purpose and Scope:

- The **Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988** is the principal central legislation dealing with corruption offences involving public servants and related bribery by individuals and commercial organisations.
- The Act consolidated and amended earlier laws relating to the prevention of corruption and provides a framework covering **offences, investigation, Special Judges, prosecution, attachment of property and related procedural safeguards**.
- The **Prevention of Corruption (Amendment) Act, 2018** significantly changed the legal framework by restructuring bribery offences, introducing liability for commercial organisations and modifying provisions relating to investigation and prosecution.

Meaning of Undue Advantage:

- **Section 2** defines **"undue advantage"** as any gratification other than legal remuneration, and the concept is not restricted to monetary or pecuniary benefits.
- This broad definition enables the law to address benefits that may not necessarily take the form of direct cash payments.

Key Provisions of the Act:

Special Judges and Trial:

- **Sections 3 and 4** provide for the appointment of **Special Judges** by the Central or State Government and require specified offences under the Act to be tried by Special Judges.
- The Special Judge mechanism is intended to facilitate specialised and relatively expeditious adjudication of corruption cases.

Bribery and Influence:

- **Section 7** deals with the offence of a public servant being bribed through acceptance or obtaining of an undue advantage.
- **Section 7A** criminalises taking an undue advantage to influence a public servant through **corrupt or illegal means or through the exercise of personal influence**.
- **Section 8** deals with the offence relating to bribing a public servant, thereby extending criminal liability beyond the public servant who receives the undue advantage.

Commercial Organisations:

- **Section 9** establishes liability of a **commercial organisation** where a person associated with it gives or promises an undue advantage to obtain or retain business or a business advantage.
- **Section 10** provides for liability of persons in charge of, and responsible for, the conduct of the business of such commercial organisations in specified circumstances.
- These provisions recognise that corruption can involve both **public officials and private-sector actors**, particularly in public procurement, licensing, contracts and regulatory decisions.

Criminal Misconduct:

- **Section 13** defines **criminal misconduct by a public servant**, including dishonest or fraudulent misappropriation or conversion of property entrusted to the public servant or under their control.
- The provision also addresses illicit enrichment and obtaining valuable things or pecuniary advantages through corrupt or illegal means or abuse of official position, subject to the statutory requirements.
- The provision is important for addressing corruption involving **abuse of public office, unlawful enrichment and misuse of entrusted public resources**.

Investigation, Prosecution and Property:

- **Section 17** specifies the categories of police officers authorised to investigate offences under the Act.
- **Section 17A**, introduced through the 2018 amendment, requires prior approval before an enquiry, inquiry or investigation into an offence relatable to a recommendation made or decision taken by a public servant while discharging official functions or duties, subject to statutory exceptions.
- **Section 18A** applies provisions concerning attachment and forfeiture of property under the **Criminal Law Amendment Ordinance, 1944** to property procured through offences under the Act, subject to the statutory framework.
- **Section 19** provides for **previous sanction for prosecution** of a public servant for specified offences, thereby seeking to balance protection of bona fide official decision-making with accountability for corruption.
- **Section 20** provides for a statutory presumption in specified circumstances where a public servant accepts or obtains an undue advantage, subject to the conditions prescribed by law.

Major Reasons for Corruption in India:

Administrative and Institutional Factors:

- **Administrative complexity** creates opportunities for corruption when excessive discretion, complicated procedures and multiple approval layers allow officials to exercise poorly regulated authority.
- The **Second Administrative Reforms Commission** recommended reducing unnecessary discretion and establishing clear rules wherever discretion cannot be eliminated, particularly in public-facing government offices.
- **Lack of transparency** in procurement, licensing, land administration and allocation of public resources can make corrupt transactions difficult to detect.
- Weak internal supervision, inadequate risk assessment and fragmented accountability can further increase opportunities for malpractice.

Delay in Investigation and Trial:

- **Prolonged investigation and judicial proceedings** reduce the certainty and immediacy of punishment, weakening the deterrent effect of anti-corruption laws.
- The large number of long-pending CBI corruption cases demonstrates that legislative provisions alone cannot ensure effective accountability without adequate investigative and judicial capacity.

Political and Institutional Interference:

- Undue influence over **investigations, appointments, transfers and institutional functioning** can undermine the independence and effectiveness of anti-corruption agencies.
- At the same time, investigative autonomy must operate alongside **legislative oversight, judicial review and institutional accountability** to prevent arbitrary exercise of investigative power.

Social and Ethical Factors:

- The normalisation of small bribes for accessing routine public services can create social tolerance towards corruption.
- **Weak whistle-blower protection** may discourage individuals from reporting wrongdoing because of fear of retaliation, harassment or professional consequences.
- Corruption is therefore not merely a legal problem but also an issue of **administrative ethics, institutional culture and public-service values**.

India's Anti-Corruption Institutional Framework:

Central Vigilance Commission:

- The **Central Vigilance Commission** functions as the apex vigilance institution for the Union Government and follows a broad approach combining **punitive, preventive and participative vigilance**.
- Its role includes vigilance oversight, advisory functions and monitoring of anti-corruption mechanisms within its statutory jurisdiction.
- The CVC's reporting on pending corruption cases demonstrates the importance of monitoring not only the registration and investigation of cases but also their **prosecution and final disposal**.

Central Bureaof Investigation:

- The **CBI** investigates major corruption and certain economic offences entrusted to it under the applicable legal and administrative framework.
- Its effectiveness depends upon adequate manpower, specialised investigation, forensic capacity, professional autonomy and timely prosecutorial support.

Lokpal:

- The **Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013** created a statutory framework for dealing with corruption allegations against specified public functionaries.
- The Lokpal strengthens the institutional architecture for **complaint-based accountability** and complements other vigilance and investigative mechanisms.

Digital Governance:

- **Digitalisation of government services** can reduce opportunities for petty corruption by limiting face-to-face interactions, increasing transparency and creating verifiable audit trails.
- Online approvals, electronic records and data-based monitoring can reduce discretionary intervention while making administrative decisions more traceable.

Direct Benefit Transfer:

- **Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT)** enables welfare benefits to reach beneficiaries directly through digital payment systems, reducing intermediaries and limiting opportunities for diversion and leakage.
- DBT therefore demonstrates how **technology and administrative reform** can complement legal measures against corruption.

Transparent Public Procurement:

- **E-tendering** and the **Government e-Marketplace (GeM)** promote standardisation, digital records and greater transparency in public procurement.
- Transparent procurement is particularly important because public contracting involves substantial government expenditure and can create significant opportunities for collusive or preferential practices.

Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988: Significance of the 2018 Amendment:

Shift in the Anti-Corruption Framework:

- The **2018 amendment** sought to modernise the law by restructuring bribery offences and explicitly criminalising the **giving of bribes**, subject to statutory safeguards.
- It introduced provisions concerning **commercial organisations**, recognising the role of private entities in corruption involving government business.
- The amendment also introduced **Section 17A**, which seeks to protect bona fide administrative decision-making from investigation based merely on official recommendations or decisions, while retaining exceptions prescribed by law.
- Changes concerning prosecution sanction under **Section 19** also seek to balance protection of public servants against frivolous prosecution with the need for accountability.

Key Governance Challenges:

Pendency and Deterrence:

- The existence of thousands of pending corruption trials, including hundreds pending for decades, indicates a gap between **legal prohibition and effective enforcement**.
- Delay can diminish deterrence because the probability and immediacy of punishment are important components of effective criminal justice.

Balancing Protection and Accountability:

- Safeguards such as **Section 17A and Section 19** can protect officials from harassment and frivolous proceedings, but excessive procedural barriers can potentially delay legitimate investigations.

- The policy challenge is therefore to ensure **protection for bona fide decisions without creating impunity for corrupt conduct**.

Fragmented Institutional Architecture:

- Anti-corruption responsibilities are distributed among institutions such as the **CVC, CBI, Lokpal, departmental vigilance authorities, State anti-corruption agencies and the judiciary**.
- Better coordination, information sharing and clearly defined institutional responsibilities are necessary to avoid duplication and jurisdictional gaps.

Way Ahead:

Time-Bound Justice:

- Corruption investigations and trials should be completed within **clearly defined and realistically achievable timelines**, supported by adequate investigative personnel, prosecutors and Special Judges.
- Case-management systems should identify exceptionally old cases and prioritise their disposal while preserving due process.

Strengthening Investigative Capacity:

- Investigative agencies require greater access to **financial forensics, digital evidence, data analytics, cyber investigation and specialised legal expertise**.
- Recruitment and training should focus on complex corruption involving shell entities, benami transactions, procurement manipulation and digital financial trails.

Institutional Independence with Accountability:

- Investigative and vigilance agencies should enjoy adequate **functional autonomy** to undertake impartial investigations while remaining subject to judicial review, parliamentary oversight and statutory accountability.
- Institutional design should prevent both **political interference and unchecked investigative power**.

Whistle-Blower Protection:

- Individuals reporting corruption in good faith should receive effective **legal, professional and physical protection** against retaliation.
- A credible reporting mechanism can improve the detection of corruption before it becomes entrenched.

Technology-Based Vigilance:

- Governments should expand the use of **data analytics, artificial intelligence, digital audit trails and financial forensics** to identify unusual transactions, procurement anomalies and high-risk administrative patterns.
- Preventive vigilance should increasingly move from complaint-driven action towards **risk-based and data-driven detection**.

Ethical Governance:

- Anti-corruption policy should combine legal enforcement with **integrity, transparency, accountability, public-service values and ethical leadership**.
- Reducing unnecessary discretion, simplifying procedures and strengthening citizen-centric service delivery can address the structural causes of corruption rather than merely punishing its consequences.

Conclusion:

- Corruption cannot be eliminated through punitive legislation alone. India requires a comprehensive framework in which **certainty and timeliness of punishment** are combined with institutional independence, preventive vigilance, digital transparency, whistle-blower protection and ethical leadership. Such an approach can transform anti-corruption policy from a predominantly reactive mechanism into a **proactive system of accountable and integrity-based governance**.