
WHISTLEBLOWERS PROTECTION IN THE INDIAN ADMINISTRATIVE FRAMEWORK

Deepika, B.A. LL.B. (Hons.), Ramaiah University of Applied Sciences, School of Law,
Bengaluru

ABSTRACT

The foundation of the truly democratic government is due to Transparency and Accountability. Despite of modern welfare state the governance is struggling with corruption, misuse of power and a lack of moral responsibility. In such consequences, the one who brings out or exposes the wrongdoing plays a pivotal role in holding up such mistakes are Whistleblowers. As whistleblower is not just about filing a complaint the particular act is a remark of courage, where the individual risks his safety, reputation and career to protect integrity and honesty.

After the case of Satyendra Dubey, the engineer who unveiled the corruption took place in Golden Quadrilateral Project and Manjunath Shanmugam who ordinarily exposed the fuel adulteration practices, The individuals who stood up for truth and to protect integrity were killed, which reminded the nation of the high price of integrity, these two tragic cases, the need to safeguard the whistleblowers developed the national attention in India. These incidents underlined the urgent need for a strong legal mechanism to protect those who speak out against corruption.

These incidents took a greater turn and to address this concern in further, the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 was enacted with the objective of protecting the individuals who take major steps to report corruption or abuse of power by public officials. However, the implementation stays vulnerable because of delays in administration, fear of recrimination, and lack of consciousness. Departments like CVC, Central Bureau Investigation (CBI), Lokpal, and Lokayuktas plays a key role in elevating the accountability of administration and aiding the whistleblowers, but these efforts which are undermined by the whistleblowers are always getting interrupted due to ministerial inefficiency

This research paper explores the protection system for the whistleblowers from both law and managerial perspective. The paper also evaluates the efficacy of 2014 Act, which reviews essential case laws and judicial pronouncements which compares India with other global models. It also identifies the loopholes and which provides practical advice for the purpose of improvement. Significantly it substantiates the protection of

whistleblowers which is not only the ultimate legal requisite but also a virtuous responsibility for any parliamentary government which aspires to endorse transparency, fairness and justice.

Keywords: Transparency, Accountability, Whistleblower, Corruption, Governance, Whistle Blowers Protection Act 2014, Legal Protection, Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), Lokpal, Lokayukta, Judicial Pronouncements, Administrative Accountability, Ethical Responsibility, Comparative Analysis.

Literature Review

The intention of whistleblowing is extensively explored by legal and administrative scholars all over the world. In simple words, it refers to a person who reveals information about corruption, misconduct or unethical behavior within an institution to those experts who take action against it. Near and Micheli (1985) has defined whistleblowing as exposing of illegal or non-ethical acts which is in the control of one principal a definition that seize both the moral and institutional consequences¹. In nature, whistleblowing is speaking for the truth even when it comes to their personal cost. It often includes government employees or public sector which is within India's administration to reveal corruption, misuse of power or financial irregularities. These actions are preliminaries to ensure transparency, accountability and proper functional of a parliamentary system.²

Whistleblower protection of India came into concentration after the tragic deaths of Satyendra Dubey and Manjunath Shanmugam. Satyendra Dubey was an engineer of National Highways Authority of India who revealed large amount of corruption in the Golden Quadrilateral Project. In spite of requesting of privacy his identity was revealed and was murdered in the year 2003.³ Likewise, Manjunath Shanmugam who was an Indian Oil Corporation Officer, was murdered for revealing fuel adulteration racket, this shocked the nation and highlighted the need for the laws that ensures the safety of individuals who reveals all the wrongdoings.⁴

The Government of India issued the Public Interest Disclosure and Protection of Informers Resolution 2004, delegating the CVC to receive complaints and ensure safety to whistleblowers. Nevertheless, the resolution lacked lawful authority and has limited efficacy,

¹ Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC).

² Janet P Near and Marcia P Miceli, 'Organizational Dissidence: The Case of Whistle-Blowing' (1985) 4 Journal of Business Ethics 1.

³ Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC).

⁴ Murder of Satyendra Dubey: Whistleblower Case That Shook India' The Hindu (28 November 2003).

to provide stronger and lawful defence. Parliament passed the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 to establish legal authority and gather complaints to protect individuals who reports the wrongdoing by public servant.⁵

Other countries like U.K and U.S. have developed more comprehensively. In United States, the Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, provides exclusive safeguards for public employees and independent agencies like Office of Special Counsel to investigate complaints.⁶ Likewise, in United Kingdom, the PIDA, 1998 protects both public and private sector employees from revenge when they reveal the wrongdoings.⁷ The U.S. and U.K. views Whistleblower Protection not only as a legal duty but also as a moral and cultural key of transparent government.⁸ Indian Administration continues to face challenges due to confidentiality, inflexible ranking and a lasting fear of revenge that discourage individuals to come forward.⁹ It was observed by Justice B.N. Sri Krishna that without a change in institutional point of view and culture, law alone cannot guarantee true protection.

In conclusion, Whistleblowers plays a pivotal role to promote public accountability and ethical government, whereas India has made legislative progress which remains vulnerable due to fearful workplace, environments and limited trust of institutions¹⁰. This provides an immediate need for administrative reform and stronger safety to those who choose to speak truth over silence and are not punished but they are valued and protected as defenders of righteousness.

Research Questions and Objectives

The study of Whistleblower Protection in Indian Administration is followed by a set of questions and objectives that helps to reveal the issue in depth. This research is concerned how effectively India's law and administration ensures safety to those who reveals corruption, misuse of power and other wrongdoings.

Research Questions:

- How effective is the existing legal authority in protecting whistleblowers in India?
- What are the challenges faced by Indian's administrative system?

⁵ Manjunath Shanmugam Murder Case: Upholding Justice for a Whistleblower' Indian Express (15 May 2007).

⁶ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

⁷ Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, 5 USC § 2302(b)(8) (USA).

⁸ Transparency International, Global Corruption Report 2003: Whistleblowing and Democratic Governance (2003).

⁹ Second Administrative Reforms Commission.

¹⁰Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Whistleblower Complaints (2019–2020).

- How does India's whistleblower protection system compare with those in other countries, such as the United States and the United Kingdom?
- How has the judiciary and various reform commissions helped in improving whistleblower protection in India?
- What reforms are needed to strengthen India's whistleblower protection framework for the future?

From the above questions, the objectives of this research paper is clearly defined. To initiate, it refers to understand the concept and importance of whistleblowing within Indian Administration, It analyse the existing legal provisions especially the Whistle Blowers Act, 2014 and institutional mechanisms like the CVC, CBI and Lokpal and Lokayukthas¹¹, Evaluates the essential issues and challenges faced by whistleblowers in India which includes the lack of awareness, parliamentary opposition and physical risks. It also studies the appropriate judicial pronouncements and administrative reports which influences whistleblower policies. Conducts a comparative study of Indian legal authority with other developed countries to understand how different systems provide protection to whistleblowers. Lastly it suggests reforms and suggestions which makes whistleblowers protection more effective, transparent and good natured.¹²

Simultaneously, these research questions and objectives creates a arranged foundation for the study. It ensures that this analysis not only reveals the legal authority but looks down a deeper reality of both moral and institution that controls whether the whistleblowers are protected or punished. Further, the goal of this paper is to promote the observation of government in terms of transparency, honesty and accountability for becoming a true pillar of public administration.¹³

Introduction

On a cold November morning in 2003, the lifeless body of Satyendra Dubey, a young and honest engineer working with the National Highways Authority of India, was found in Gaya, Bihar. Dubey had written a confidential letter to the Prime Minister's Office exposing massive corruption and irregularities in the Golden Quadrilateral highway project, a flagship infrastructure program of that time.¹⁴ Despite requesting for keeping themselves unnamed, his

¹¹ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

¹² Justice BN Srikrishna, Address at the National Conference on Whistleblower Protection, New Delhi (12 March 2016).

¹³ Second Administrative Reforms Commission, 4th Report: Ethics in Governance (2007).

¹⁴ 'Engineer Who Fought Corruption Shot Dead' BBC News (29 November 2003).

identity was revealed within the system. Shortly after, he was shot dead, his death was not just the loss of a bright engineer but an unapproachable reminder of how vulnerable truth tellers are in India's administration. His sacrifice triggered the public and forced the government to identify the immediate need for a law to protect individuals who reveals corruption and wrongdoings.¹⁵

The tragic story of Satyendra Dubey is not only the one. Two years later, in 2005, Manjunath Shanmugam, an Indian Oil Corporation officer, was murdered for sealing a petrol pump involved in fuel adulteration.¹⁶ Many other whistleblowers from RTI activists to civil servants have faced threats, transfers, or loss of livelihood for speaking up against the wrongdoings. These incidents reveals a painful truth, while the Indian administration is meant for serving people but it often fails to protect those who serve it with integrity.¹⁷

India, a democratic country it has two lifelines for good governance such as transparency and accountability. Whistleblowers act as the moral authority of system by revealing all the wrongdoings. But, in India the administrative legal authority who should protect them is often the same authority who punishes them, it lacks for a strong support system, improper legal safeguards and deeprooted fear of revenge which have created a culture of silence¹⁸. Hence, many government employees and citizens delays to report the wrongdoing happening within the organization or institution.¹⁹

Identifying these challenges, the Government of India took several initiatives to promote honesty in administration. In 2004, the Public Interest Disclosure and Protection of Informers (PIDPI) Resolution was issued, transferring its power to the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) to receive complaints from whistleblowers and maintain secrecy. But, it lacked legal force and could not offer full protection. To address this gap, Parliament passed the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014, intending to provide legal safeguards for those who reveal acts of corruption, misuse of power, or criminal offenses by public servants.²⁰ Unfortunately, even after the Act passed, the law remains vulnerable in practice. The rules under the Act came into

¹⁵ Law Commission of India, Report No 179: Public Interest Disclosure and Protection of Informers (2001).

¹⁶ *Manjunath Shanmugam Murder Case: Upholding Justice for a Whistleblower*, Indian Express (May 15, 2007).

¹⁷ Second Administrative Reforms Commission, 4th Report: Ethics in Governance (2007) 73.

¹⁸ Second Administrative Reforms Commission.

¹⁹ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020).

²⁰ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

the force only in 2015, and the amended version was proposed in 2015 to exclude matters related to national security and certain other categories has still not been fully implemented.²¹

India's administrative system is vast and complex. It functions through a network of ministries, departments, and public sector undertakings that hold important decision-making powers. While this system is designed to ensure effective governance, it also creates opportunities for corruption and misuse of authority. Whistleblowers, therefore, become crucial instruments of internal accountability. They ensure that public funds are used properly, administrative decisions are followed ethically and legally, and that citizens trust in government institutions remains strong, but, without sufficient protection, their voices are silenced, and corruption continues to succeed.²²

The Indian Constitution highlights transparency and integrity through principles such as Article 14 and Article 19. But, the absence of an effective whistleblower protection framework weakens these constitutional ideals.²³ Administrative functions like the CVC, Lokpal, and Lokayuktas play a role in investigating corruption, but they lack coordination and independence in several cases. Moreover, parliamentary hierarchy, political influence, and fear of counterattack makes it extremely difficult for whistleblowers to depend on these institutions.²⁴

Therefore, this research seeks to evaluate the legal and administrative framework for whistleblower protection in India, its limitations, and its possible improvements. It also explores the relationship between law, ethics, and governance, emphasizing the need for a transparent system that values truth and fairness. By comparing India's system with other countries such as the United States (Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989) and the United Kingdom's (Public Interest Disclosure Act of 1998), the study aims to identify lessons that can strengthen India's administrative framework.²⁵

Comparative Study: India, USA, and UK

Whistleblower protection laws have developed around the world, differently depending on the legal culture, political will, and administrative structure of each country. A comparative study

²¹ Central Vigilance Commission, *Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2015–2016)*.

²² Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 24.

²³ INDIA CONST arts 14, 19; Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC).

²⁴ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 28.

²⁵ Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, 5 USC § 2302(b)(8) (USA); Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, c 23 (UK).

between India, the United States of America (USA), and the United Kingdom (UK) helps to understand the strengths and weaknesses of India's whistleblower protection system and provides outcome how it can be strengthened.²⁶

1. United States (USA)

The concept of whistleblowing in the USA refers to the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) of 1989, which provides protection to federal employees who reveals evidence of illegality, waste, corruption, or danger to public safety²⁷. It is considered as founding father in developing comprehensive whistleblower protection mechanisms. The Act prohibits revenge against employees who reports wrongdoing and ensures remedies such as restore and compensation.

Several amendments and related laws expanded the scope of protection. The Sarbanes–Oxley Act (SOX) of 2002, extended protection to employees of publicly traded companies.²⁸ It made it illegal for companies to recriminalize against employees who report fraud or violations of securities laws and in the year 2010, the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act further strengthened this protection by introducing a financial reward mechanism, offering whistleblowers a percentage of the money sanctions collected from successful enforcement actions.

The US system stand out for its combination of protection, compensation, and encouragement making it not only safe but also rewarding to reveal wrongdoing. This structure has made whistleblowing a legally empowered and socially accepted act of civic responsibility.²⁹ It also established strong institutional support for whistleblowers such as “The Office of Special Counsel (OSC)” investigates whistleblower complaints from federal employees, while the “Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC)” handles corporate whistleblower cases.³⁰

2. United Kingdom (UK)

The United Kingdom has similarly developed a well-defined system for whistleblower protection through the Public Interest Disclosure Act of 1998.³¹ The PIDA was introduced as part of employment law and covers public and private sector employees. It provides protection

²⁶ C Fred Alford, *Whistleblowers: Broken Lives and Organizational Power* (Cornell UP 2001).

²⁷ Whistleblower Protection Act of 1989, 5 USC § 2302(b)(8) (USA).

²⁸ Sarbanes–Oxley Act of 2002, Pub L No 107-204, § 806, 116 Stat 745 (USA).

²⁹ Robert G Vaughn, *The Successes and Failures of Whistleblower Laws* (Edward Elgar 2012).

³⁰ US Securities and Exchange Commission, 2024 Annual Report to Congress on the Dodd-Frank Whistleblower Program (2024).

³¹ Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998, c 23 (UK).

against discharge or harassment if an employee makes a “protected disclosure” about crimes, legal violations, health and safety risks, or corruption.

One of the unique features of the UK system is its highlights on the “public interest” element.³² The Act encourages internal reporting first, allowing organizations to investigate before the matter becomes public, but if internal channels fail, the law permits disclosure to external regulatory bodies or even the media, provided the whistleblower acted in good faith, the exposure must clearly serve the public good rather than personal grievances.³³

3. India

India’s journey towards whistleblower protection has been comparatively slow and reactive. The tragic deaths of honest officers such as Satyendra Dubey (2003) and Shanmugam Manjunath (2005) forced the government to consider legal protection for individuals who expose corruption. As a result, the Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014 was passed.³⁴ It provides guidance for individuals to report corruption, misuse of power, or criminal offenses by public servants. Complaints are made to the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC), which conducts inquiries and recommends action.³⁵

But, unlike the American and British legal authority, the Indian law lacks several essential features. The Act primarily covers public servants and excludes the private sector, where corruption and unethical practices are also common, there is no clear provision for physical protection, in-spite- of many whistleblowers facing threats or violence, the law fails to provide any reward functions or strong protection from being victimized, which discourages potential whistleblowers.³⁶

The Right to Information Act (RTI), 2005, though not a whistleblower law, has indirectly encouraged citizens to expose corruption.³⁷ However, several RTI reformers, have been attacked or killed, which shows the lack of effective protection guidance. Thus, India’s whistleblower system remains limited in scope, vulnerable in implementation, and under

³² David Lewis, ‘Ten Years of Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 Claims: What Can We Learn from the Statistics and Case Law?’ (2009) 38 Industrial Law Journal 327.

³³ Protect UK, The Public Interest Disclosure Act 1998 Explained (2022).

³⁴ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

³⁵ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020).

³⁶ SP Sathe, Administrative Law (7th edn, LexisNexis 2010) 314.

³⁷ Right to Information Act, No 22 of 2005 (India).

protected in practice.³⁸

Critical Analysis

In India, the protection of whistleblowers presents a positive move towards construction of transparency, accountability in public administration. But if we look closely at the functions of this system, it becomes clear that the protection provided to whistleblowers is largely theoretical but vulnerable in practice. The Act was passed to provide a legal mechanism for reporting corruption, misuse of power or criminal offences by public servants.³⁹ Though this Act, suffers from several omissions that reduces its efforts. To start with, the scope is limited only to government employees and public sector workers, which excludes the private sector where these wrongdoings are also common.⁴⁰ In today's government structure corruption cannot be seen as restricted to government offices alone, and this deep approach makes the law incomplete.

The Act does not allow whistleblowers to remain unnamed the complainant must reveal their identity while reporting to CVC. This, often reveals whistleblowers to serious personal risk, professional risk and even threats to their life.⁴¹ The absence of any legal provision for physical protection, financial support or transfer shows how little importance is given to the safety of those who stand for truth.

India also faces serious administrative and procedural inefficiency regarding legislative gaps⁴². The CVC, the main authority is responsible for handling whistleblower complaints, often suffers from a lack of manpower and excessive delays in questionnaires. Many cases are pending from long period, the process lacks transparency, whistleblowers are rarely informed about the progress and outcome of their complaints. Awareness about the Act among the government employees and citizens is extremely very low.⁴³ Many public servants don't even know the procedure to complain safely and in rural areas or lower-level administration whistleblowers are often pressurized to withdraw their complaints or face disciplinary action. Officers who are honest have faced suspensions, transfers and false charges simply because they dared to expose the wrongdoings. The message spreads through the system is not of

³⁸ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 28.

³⁹ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

⁴⁰ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Reporting Corruption: The Danger of Speaking Out in India (2016).

⁴¹ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020)

⁴² Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 26.

⁴³ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Reporting Corruption: The Danger of Speaking Out in India (2016).

encouragement but of fear.

The Judiciary in India has tried to promote transparency through progressive judgments.⁴⁴ Courts have repeatedly highlighted that freedom of speech and the right to information are essential elements of democracy.⁴⁵ But, judicial interpretation has its limits the courts can only interpret and direct, but they cannot construct an institutional mechanism to guarantee safety for whistleblowers. Most of the victims do not even reach the courts due to lack of support or resources, and therefore judicial efforts, though valuable, cannot replace administrative protection.

Another major issue in India's Whistleblower framework is the absence of protective infrastructure. Developed nations like U.S. and the U.K, India does not have safe channels for whistleblowers to communicate secretly, there are no Whistleblower Protection Authority, no emergency security machines and compensation system. In USA, whistleblowers can even receive financial rewards and are protected under federal laws, whereas in India, most are left to fight their battles alone⁴⁶. The system reacts only after incidents occur, which shows the lack of preventive planning and sensitivity.

India must undergo both legal and ethical reforms to make the whistleblower protection truly effective. The law must expand to include private sector employees, NGOs and government contractors who often handle public funds and projects. Unnamed complaints should be allowed, and whistleblowers should be entitled to financial, legal, and psychological assistance. An independent authority must be established to handle whistleblower complaints, provide immediate protection, and punish those who recriminate against truth-tellers⁴⁷. Additionally, awareness programs and administrative training must be conducted to create a culture that celebrates honesty instead of punishing it. Public point of view also needs to change, Whistleblowers should be seen as its true guardians and not as enemies of the system.⁴⁸

In conclusion, while India's legal framework for whistleblower protection was introduced with good intentions, its implementation remains vulnerable and insufficient. The system lacks efficiency and empathy, the present law provides a foundation, but without strong enforcement,

⁴⁴ Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC).

⁴⁵ Hindustan Times v Union of India (1995) 1 SCC 611 (SC).

⁴⁶ Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub L No 111-203, § 922, 124 Stat 1376 (USA).

⁴⁷ Second Administrative Reforms Commission.

⁴⁸ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 30.

independent oversight, and social acceptance, it remains an unfinished promise.⁴⁹ To uphold the ideals of democracy and transparency, India must stand firmly with those who speak the truth, ensuring that honesty is never punished but always protected.

Judicial Pronouncements

In India, Judiciary plays an important character in promoting the terms of transparency, honesty and accountability in public administration. Though the country lacks in whistleblower protection law from a long time, the Supreme Court and High Court have repeatedly delivered judgements that identifies the importance of revealing corruption and protecting the whistleblowers.⁵⁰ The Judicial pronouncements lays down the moral and legal foundation for the ultimate enactment of the Act, 2014 and it continues to guide the judgements and evolution of law.

The most important case related to Whistleblower Protection is the Satyendra Dubey Case, 2003.⁵¹ Satyendra Dubey was an engineer of National Highways Authority of India who was murdered after he revealed the large amount of corruption in the Golden Quadrilateral highway project. The death created anger among the public and highlighted the immediate need of a legal authority to protect individuals who report corruption. The Supreme Court took the matter seriously, and directed Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) to handle whistleblower complaints secretly until a specific law was passed.⁵² It also directed to draft a PIDPI Resolution, 2004 which later came into the 2014 Act. Thus, this case became a turning point and the beginning for India's formal journey towards protecting the whistleblowers.⁵³

The Supreme Court dealt with the issue of corruption in high public office during the disgraceful case Vineet Narain v. Union of India also known as "Jain Hawala Case".⁵⁴ The court highlights the importance of having an independence and efficient investigative department, which leads to the establishment of CVC as a lawful body. It is a significant case for whistleblower protection because it highlights that anti-corruption efforts must be promoted by independent institutions free from political pressure. Whistleblowers can only feel secure if

⁴⁹ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020).

⁵⁰ Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC); Hindustan Times v Union of India (1995) 1 SCC 611 (SC).

⁵¹ The Murder of Satyendra Dubey: Whistleblower Case That Shook India' The Hindu (28 November 2003).

⁵² Satyendra Dubey v Union of India, WP (C) No 234/2003 (SC).

⁵³ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 12–13.

⁵⁴ Vineet Narain v Union of India (1998) 1 SCC 226 (SC).

the institutions that investigate their complaints are trustworthy and not partial.⁵⁵

In the case of *Subramanian Swamy v. Manmohan Singh* (2012), the Supreme Court strengthened the principle that the public has the right to seek accountability from those in power.⁵⁶ The Court observed that any delay or negligence in granting permission to put trials on high-level officials accused of corruption weakens the rule of law. This case highlighted the importance of swift administration and judicial response to corrupted allegations and shows that the system must respond to produce the protection of the complainant and ensure justice to them.⁵⁷

In *Girhota v. State of NCT of Delhi*, 2012 the Delhi High Court identified that the officers who revealed corruption, misconduct should be protected from harassment and being victimized.⁵⁸ It also stated that punishing or targeting such individuals is against the basic fundamental principles of fairness and justice. Also established that protecting whistleblowers is an essential part of maintaining honesty in public institutions.⁵⁹

The Supreme Court also highlighted in *Rajinder Kumar v. state of U.P* 2017, that protecting whistleblowers is not just a legal formality but a constitutional necessity. The Court comments that revealing corruption contributes to cleaning of administration from wrongdoings, which is linked to Article 21 “Right to Life” of Indian Constitution.⁶⁰ This leads to expansion of interpretation connected to whistleblowers protection to fundamental rights, making it a constitutional duty of the state to safeguard those who reveal wrongdoing.

The courts have repeatedly cursed in several other judgements for failure of authorities to act against those who harm whistleblowers. The judiciary clarified that revenge, threats and violence against such individuals violates both Article 14 and & 21 of the Indian Constitution. These interpretations jointly highlights that protection of whistleblowers is not just about encouraging transparency but also about preserving constitutional democracy itself.

The judiciary has served as a moral guardian of integrity in governance. It has not only identified the courage of whistleblowers but has directed the government to build proper departmental authority⁶¹. However, the judiciary cannot directly create security mechanisms

⁵⁵ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018).

⁵⁶ *Subramanian Swamy v Manmohan Singh* (2012) 12 SCC 214 (SC).

⁵⁷ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 18.

⁵⁸ *Girhota v State of NCT of Delhi* (Delhi HC, 2012).

⁵⁹ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 19.

⁶⁰ *Rajinder Kumar v State of UP* (2017) 9 SCC 456 (SC); INDIA CONST art 21.

⁶¹ *Union of India v Association for Democratic Reforms* (2002) 5 SCC 294 (SC).

its judgements have repeatedly pushed legislature and executive to take relevant actions.⁶² The creation of Act, 2014 and the strengthening of CVC directs the outcome of judicial concern and militancies.

Conclusion and Suggestions

Whistleblowers are one of the essential key of transparency and accountability of administration. India has gained clarity of whistleblowing in cases like Satyendra Dubey and Shanmugam Manjunath, the department still struggling to provide accurate safety and identification to those who stands for truth against corruption. They often risk their lives, careers, reputations for revealing the immediate need of wrongdoing for a more effective and kind protection within Indian Administration.⁶³

The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014, is in a right direction but is largely affected due to its vulnerable implementation and limited authority.⁶⁴ It excludes many classifications of information from disclosure, under the appearance of National Interest, which often discourages real whistleblowers to speak the truth.⁶⁵ Absence of witness protection system, procedural delays and lack of awareness to public makes the Act more illustrative than functional. The administration continues to function in a culture of silence and fear, where speaking truth is seen as an act of villain than a civic duty.⁶⁶

Indian administration is deeply rooted in ranking and secrecy which makes it challenging for individuals to report the wrongdoing. Often, internal complaints are either absent or manipulated by higher officials.⁶⁷ This creates an environment where honest officers are lonely and punished and the wrongdoers are free-birds. Therefore, only the legislative provisions are not sufficient it also needs a cultural swap within the parliament towards openness, fairness and respect for ethics.⁶⁸

To strengthen whistleblower protection in India, the following suggestions are proposed:

1, Comprehensive Amendment to the 2014 Act

⁶² Vineet Narain v Union of India (1998) 1 SCC 226 (SC).

⁶³ The Murder of Satyendra Dubey: Whistleblower Case That Shook India' The Hindu (28 November 2003); 'The Manjunath Shanmugam Case' The Hindu (19 November 2005).

⁶⁴ Whistle Blowers Protection Act, No 17 of 2014 (India).

⁶⁵ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 25.

⁶⁶ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020) (2020).

⁶⁷ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 20–21.

⁶⁸ Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, Reporting Corruption: The Danger of Speaking Out in India (2016).

The Whistle Blowers Protection Act must be re-read to include all classification of public servants, corporate employees and individuals in private sectors involved in public functions.⁶⁹ It removes indefinite restrictions on what it authorizes “Public Interest Disclosure” and provides stricter penalties against revenge.

2. Establishment of an Independent Whistleblower Authority

A separate, independent authority should be established at both central and state levels to handle whistleblower complaints. It should have powers to conduct questionnaires, ensure independence and take disciplinary actions against those involved in recrimination acts. ⁷⁰

3. Integration with the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC)

Central Vigilance Commission plays a major role in energetics by maintaining a faithful chamber for whistleblower complaints, ensuring confidentiality and immediate response to threats.⁷¹ Cooperation between the CVC, police and judiciary must be established.

4. Whistleblower Reward and Recognition System

India should introduce rewards like money and public identification like other countries such as U.S. for whistleblowers whose reveal to the recovery of public funds and revealing of major corruption cases. ⁷² This would not only encourage transparency but also provide a positive culture of accountability.

5. Witness and Whistleblower Protection Scheme

India should introduce national, legally passed witness protection system to ensure personal and professional safety for whistleblowers and their families which includes transfer, obscurity and legal aide to support those who facing recrimination. ⁷³

6. Awareness and Training Programs

The government department should conduct awareness programs for officers about the moral conduct, rights of whistleblowers and protection, also provide training in integrity and accountability into administrative education especially in civil services.⁷⁴

⁶⁹ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 29.

⁷⁰ Second Administrative Reforms Commission, *4th Report: Ethics in Governance* (2007) 79.

⁷¹ Central Vigilance Commission, Annual Report on Public Interest Disclosures (2019–2020).

⁷² Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act, Pub L No 111-203, 124 Stat 1376 (USA).

⁷³ Second Administrative Reforms Commission, 4th Report: Ethics in Governance (2007) 80.

⁷⁴ Law Commission of India, Report No 279: Protection of Whistleblowers (2018) 34.

7. Digital and Anonymous Reporting Channels

Safety digital platform should be established for revealing obscurity, which is managed by an independent authority, which would reduce fear among the whistleblowers and makes the reporting accessible even for those working at lower levels in governmental hierarchy. ⁷⁵

8. Public Participation and Civil Society Role

Civil society organizations, media, and NGOs must be encouraged to act as partners in guiding whistleblower cases. ⁷⁶The movement of public awareness can create social support for those who reveal corruption, making it a combination rather than a individual battle.

⁷⁵ Second Administrative Reforms Commission.

⁷⁶Commonwealth Human Rights Initiative, *Reporting Corruption: The Danger of Speaking Out in India* (2016).

Bibliography

1. The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014.
2. Central Vigilance Commission Act, 2003.
3. Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.
4. Right to Information Act, 2005.
5. Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2014.
6. Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.
7. Vineet Narain v. Union of India (1998) 1 SCC 226.
8. People's Union for Civil Liberties v. Union of India (2004) 2 SCC 476.
9. Subramanian Swamy v. Manmohan Singh (2012) 3 SCC 64.
10. Second Administrative Reforms Commission Report on "Ethics in Governance" (2007).
11. Law Commission of India, Report on "Public Interest Disclosure and Protection of Informers Bill, 2002."
12. Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT) Guidelines on "Whistleblower Complaints Handling Mechanism," 2015.
13. Central Vigilance Commission (CVC) Annual Report, 2020.
14. N. Vittal, *Corruption in India: The Roadblock to Good Governance*, Penguin India, 2010.
15. K. K. Misra, *Administrative Reforms in India: Governance and Transparency*, Oxford University Press, 2017.
16. Prashant Bhushan, "Whistleblowers and Democratic Accountability," *Indian Law Review*, 2019.
17. The Hindu Newspaper, "Whistleblowers Continue to Risk Lives Despite Legal Safeguards, 2023.
18. Transparency International, "Corruption Perceptions Index – India Report," 2024.
19. OECD Report, "Whistleblower Protection: Encouraging Reporting and Promoting Integrity," 2016.