THE ROLE OF LOKPAL AND LOKAYUKTA IN COMBATING ELITE DEVIANCE IN INDIA

Yuvaraj D, LL.M., The Tamilnadu Dr. Ambedkar Law University

ABSTRACT

Corruption operates as a severe systemic impediment to democratic governance, economic equity, and the rule of law in India. While traditional criminal jurisprudence effectively addresses conventional street offenses, the Indian state struggles profoundly with "elite deviance"—the sophisticated, large-scale malfeasance perpetrated by individuals occupying the highest echelons of political and bureaucratic power. The Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, emerged as a landmark statutory intervention designed to institutionalize accountability and bypass compromised executive investigative agencies. However, the legislation's operational reality frequently betrays its transformative promise. This research paper critically evaluates the statutory framework of the Lokpal and state-level Lokayuktas, arguing that structural limitations, political interference, and an overarching reliance on criminal conviction models have rendered these anti-corruption ombudsmen largely symbolic. By analyzing seminal Supreme Court jurisprudence, empirical performance data from the Karnataka Lokayukta, and the procedural loopholes within the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, this paper exposes the systemic lacunae shielding unscrupulous elites. The study advocates for an urgent paradigm shift from purely punitive mechanisms to comprehensive, prophylactic administrative reforms, demanding absolute institutional autonomy for the Lokpal to function as a genuine pillar of democratic accountability.

Keywords: Elite Deviance, Lokpal and Lokayuktas, Institutional Accountability, Anti-Corruption Reforms.

CHAPTER - I

INTRODUCTION: CONCEPTUALIZING ELITE DEVIANCE AND SYSTEMIC CORRUPTION IN INDIA

The architecture of criminal justice in India has historically demonstrated a profound asymmetry: it remains exceedingly punitive toward the marginalized while offering broad impunity to the powerful. To understand the operational challenges of anti-corruption frameworks, legal scholars must first conceptualize the sociological paradigm of "elite deviance." Expanding upon Edwin Sutherland's pioneering theories of white-collar criminality, elite deviance in the Indian context denotes the sophisticated abuse of public office for private gain by individuals positioned at the apex of socio-political hierarchies.[1] Unlike petty, transactional bribery—which plagues citizens in their daily interface with local bureaucracy—elite deviance involves grand corruption, systemic rent-seeking, and the deliberate subversion of macroeconomic policies. These offenses do not merely enrich the perpetrators; they fundamentally distort policy-making, compromise the integrity of public institutions, and threaten the foundational rule of law.[2]

The academic discourse frequently highlights the staggering economic magnitude of elite deviance. Empirical analyses of public corruption scandals emerging after the year 2000 suggest that the median monetary value of a high-level scam in India hovers around Rs. 12,000 crore, with mean valuations reaching up to Rs. 36,000 crore [cite: 2.2.9]. These figures underscore an illicit political economy where crony capitalism and bureaucratic complicity intersect. Yet, despite the catastrophic economic toll of these mega-scandals, the Indian legal apparatus has historically struggled to secure convictions against top-tier politicians and senior civil servants. Traditional criminal law mechanisms, initially codified under the Indian Penal Code, 1860, and later the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PCA), proved inadequate in prosecuting the ruling elite.[3]

The inadequacy of the traditional framework stems from a structural paradox: the very agencies tasked with investigating political corruption operate directly under the administrative control of the political executive. This dynamic creates an inherent conflict of interest, rendering

[1] Edwin H. Sutherland, White-Collar Criminality, 5 Am. Soc. Rev. 1, 9 (1940).
[2] Upendra Baxi, Liberty and Corruption: The Antulay Case and Beyond 45 (1989).
[3] The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, No. 49, Acts of Parliament, 1988 (India).

agencies like the Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI) structurally incapable of aggressively pursuing elite deviants within the ruling dispensation. Consequently, legal and civil society reformers recognized that combating elite deviance required a paradigm shift—an independent, statutory ombudsman shielded from executive interference, possessing autonomous powers of inquiry, investigation, and prosecution.

The demand for such an institution birthed the concept of the Lokpal at the central level and Lokayuktas at the state level. However, translating this conceptual necessity into a functional statutory reality has proven extraordinarily complex. As subsequent chapters will elucidate, the legislative framework governing these ombudsmen remains fraught with deliberate loopholes designed to protect the very individuals the institution was created to police. The transition from systemic impunity to absolute accountability demands a rigorous deconstruction of how elite deviance operates within the shadows of the law, and why statutory bodies like the Lokpal frequently devolve into toothless tigers when confronting the apex of political power.

CHAPTER - II: LEGISLATIVE GENESIS AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE LOKPAL AND LOKAYUKTAS ACT, 2013

The institutionalization of the Lokpal represents one of the most protracted legislative struggles in the history of the Indian Republic. The concept first gained formal traction in 1966 when the First Administrative Reforms Commission, headed by Morarji Desai, recommended the establishment of a two-tier ombudsman mechanism—the Lokpal at the Centre and Lokayuktas in the States—to address citizens' grievances and allegations of administrative corruption.[4] Despite this early recommendation, eight successive legislative attempts to enact a Lokpal Bill between 1968 and 2011 collapsed on the floor of Parliament, entirely due to entrenched political resistance. It was not until the unprecedented nationwide civil society mobilization of 2011, spearheaded by the "India Against Corruption" movement, that the political elite capitulated, resulting in the enactment of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013.[5]

The 2013 Act theoretically revolutionized the anti-corruption landscape by establishing an independent, multi-member statutory body possessing vast jurisdictional reach. Under Section 14 of the Act, the Lokpal's jurisdiction encompasses the Prime Minister, current and former Union Ministers, Members of Parliament, and all categories of public servants (Groups A, B,

[4] Administrative Reforms Commission, Interim Report on Problems of Redress of Citizens' Grievances (1966).
[5] The Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act, 2013, No. 1, Acts of Parliament, 2014 (India).

C, and D).[6] This explicitly dismantled the historical immunities that shielded elite political figures from independent scrutiny. Furthermore, to remedy the historical politicization of investigative agencies, the Act authorized the Lokpal to exercise powers of superintendence and direction over the CBI in relation to cases referred to it by the Lokpal. For the first time, the legislation formally separated the investigative apparatus from the prosecutorial framework, empowering the Lokpal to initiate prosecution against public servants in special anti-corruption courts.

Despite these robust statutory provisions, an analytical examination reveals that the Act's operational mechanisms are deeply flawed, transforming the Lokpal into a symbol of reform rather than an instrument of substantive accountability. The procedural architecture mandates an arduous preliminary inquiry process before a formal investigation can commence. Under Section 20 of the Act, the Lokpal must first order an inquiry by its internal wing or an external agency to ascertain whether a prima facie case exists. This preliminary filter, while theoretically designed to prevent frivolous complaints, practically affords elite deviants ample opportunity to subvert evidence and mobilize political capital to stall proceedings.

Moreover, the operational record of the central Lokpal remains conspicuously dismal. Scholars evaluating the institution's performance highlight that the Lokpal's prosecutorial success rate against high-ranking political elites is virtually negligible. The Act itself was crippled at its inception by an inexcusable five-year delay in appointing the first Chairperson and members. The central government cited a statutory technicality—the absence of a formally recognized Leader of the Opposition in the Lok Sabha to sit on the Selection Committee—as the pretext for this delay, exposing the lack of political will to operationalize the ombudsman. Consequently, while the legislation promises to enforce accountability, the Lokpal's architecture remains encumbered by structural limitations that preserve the status quo.

CHAPTER - III

JUDICIAL INTERVENTIONS, PIL & STRUCTURAL INJUNCTIONS

The chronic failure of the political executive to proactively address elite deviance has compelled the Indian judiciary to occupy the anti-corruption vanguard. Over the past three decades, the Supreme Court of India has extensively utilized Public Interest Litigation (PIL) to

[6] Id. at § 14.

monitor high-profile corruption scandals, developing a robust jurisprudence of "anticorruption by fiat."[7] When statutory mechanisms break down, the Court issues structural injunctions—often termed writs of "continuing mandamus"—to compel the executive to investigate powerful individuals. This judicial methodology ensures that investigations into elite deviance remain under the direct supervision of constitutional courts, theoretically insulating the investigating agencies from political interference.

The landmark judgment in *Vineet Narain v. Union of India* firmly established the Court's willingness to breach executive domains to combat corruption.[8] Confronting the massive Hawala scandal, which implicated several senior politicians across party lines, the Supreme Court recognized that the CBI operated as a "caged parrot," entirely subservient to its political masters. The Court consequently issued comprehensive directives to grant functional autonomy to the CBI and the Central Vigilance Commission (CVC). While *Vineet Narain* sought to institutionalize agency independence, the subsequent decades demonstrated that executive ingenuity consistently outpaced judicial directives, necessitating continuous judicial oversight over the investigative process.

The judiciary's intersection with the Lokpal framework is equally profound. As previously noted, the Union government delayed the constitution of the Lokpal for nearly five years following the passage of the 2013 Act. It required aggressive litigation by civil society organizations to force the executive's hand. In *Common Cause v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court delivered a scathing indictment of the government's delaying tactics.[9]

The Court rejected the Union's argument that the Lokpal could not be constituted without an officially recognized Leader of the Opposition on the selection panel. The bench judiciously interpreted the statute to ensure that the absence of one committee member would not vitiate the selection process, effectively commanding the government to operationalize the anti-corruption ombudsman.

Despite these critical interventions, reliance on judicial activism to combat systemic corruption presents inherent jurisprudential hazards. Structural injunctions are fundamentally reactive;

[7] Chintan Chandrachud, Anticorruption by Fiat: Structural Injunctions and Public Interest Litigation in the Supreme Court of India, 14 Socio-Legal Rev. 170 (2018).
[8] Vineet Narain v. Union of India, (1998) 1 S.C.C. 226 (India).
[9] Common Cause, A Registered Society v. Union of India, (1996) 1 S.C.C. 753 (India) (and subsequent connected orders regarding the Lokpal appointment).

they address corruption post facto and place an unsustainable administrative burden on the judiciary. Furthermore, while the Supreme Court can mandate the appointment of the Lokpal or monitor specific investigations, it cannot cure the underlying statutory deficiencies that cripple the ombudsman's day-to-day operations. The judiciary's "anticorruption by fiat" serves as an emergency respiratory system for a suffocating democracy, but it cannot permanently substitute the necessity for a proactively functioning, fully autonomous statutory ombudsman.

CHAPTER - IV

THE STATE-LEVEL MICROCOSM: ASSESSING THE PERFORMANCE OF LOKAYUKTAS

The overwhelming focus on the central Lokpal frequently eclipses a crucial empirical reality: anti-corruption ombudsmen have existed at the state level in India for several decades. Consequently, the performance of the state-level Lokayuktas serves as a vital microcosm, providing empirical evidence regarding the efficacy of the ombudsman model in the Indian socio-political context. The Lokpal debate has historically proceeded upon the questionable assumption that establishing a powerful national institution will automatically curb systemic corruption, without adequately analyzing the institutional failures and successes of the existing state models.

The Karnataka Lokayukta stands as the most prominent case study of state-level anti-corruption enforcement. Established under the Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984, the institution attained national prominence between 2001 and 2011 due to aggressive, independent leadership.[10]

Researchers evaluating the institution during this period noted substantial successes in addressing sector-specific corruption. For instance, collaborative efforts between the Lokayukta and the Vigilance Director for Health significantly curtailed systemic corruption within public health infrastructure, exposing informal payments, the diversion of drug supplies, and corrupt tendering processes. The Lokayukta mobilized citizen awareness, leading to a massive surge in public complaints and demonstrably increasing citizen trust in administrative accountability mechanisms.

[10] The Karnataka Lokayukta Act, 1984, No. 4, Acts of Karnataka State Legislature, 1985 (India).

However, an empirical analysis of the Karnataka Lokayukta's overall case data reveals a disturbing structural reality: the institution primarily functioned to police low-level administrative personnel rather than elite deviants. Between 1995 and 2011, the Karnataka Lokayukta conducted merely 357 suo motu raids against individual officials, compared to thousands of "trap" cases executed in response to private citizen complaints. More than 80% of these trap cases targeted lower-level officials in revenue, police, and local government departments. This data indicates that even the most powerful state-level ombudsmen are heavily reliant on citizen complaints, naturally skewing their prosecutorial focus toward localized, petty bribery rather than investigating complex, systemic elite deviance.

Furthermore, the Karnataka experience illustrates the profound vulnerability of the ombudsman to political retaliation. When the Karnataka Lokayukta began investigating severe mining scams involving incumbent cabinet ministers and Chief Ministers, the political establishment retaliated swiftly. Successive state governments systematically undermined the institution by stripping its suo motu investigatory powers and ultimately creating a parallel Anti-Corruption Bureau (ACB) directly controlled by the executive. By transferring police powers from the independent Lokayukta to the executive-controlled ACB, the political elite effectively neutralized the threat. This sequence of events unequivocally demonstrates that statutory design, no matter how robust on paper, inevitably fails when political forces choose to dismantle the agency's operational autonomy.

CHAPTER - V

SYSTEMIC LACUNAE: INVESTIGATING AGENCIES AND POLITICAL WEAPONIZATION

The inability of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas to successfully prosecute elite deviants is not merely a consequence of administrative inefficiency; it is the direct result of systemic, statutory lacunae deliberately engineered to shield the unscrupulous. The Indian anti-corruption framework contains several procedural bottlenecks that serve as structural impediments to justice. Chief among these is the contentious requirement for "prior sanction" to prosecute public servants, an archaic protection embedded within Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (PCA).[11] This provision mandates that investigating agencies must obtain

[11] The Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988, § 19.

prior administrative approval from the competent government authority before initiating criminal prosecution against a public servant.

While the theoretical justification for the prior sanction rule is to protect honest officials from frivolous and vexatious litigation, its practical application has proven disastrous. The political executive routinely weaponizes the sanctioning authority, sitting on requests for years or arbitrarily denying permission to shield favored bureaucrats and political allies. The Supreme Court of India has repeatedly decried this practice. In *Subramanian Swamy v. Director, Central Bureau of Investigation*, the Court struck down the analogous Section 6-A of the Delhi Special Police Establishment Act, ruling that insulating senior bureaucrats from investigation violates the constitutional guarantee of equality before the law.[12] Despite such judicial pronouncements, the legislature swiftly introduced new amendments to the PCA in 2018, expanding the prior sanction requirement even to the stage of preliminary inquiry, further fortifying the defensive walls around elite deviants.

Compounding the problem of statutory shields is the severe politicization of India's premier investigating agencies, namely the CBI, the Enforcement Directorate (ED), and state-level Anti-Corruption Bureaus. As noted by leading legal practitioners, these agencies frequently operate not as impartial instruments of justice, but as coercive tools deployed by the ruling dispensation to intimidate political opposition.

Selective prosecution remains a glaring hallmark of the Indian criminal justice system; investigations into corruption are vigorously pursued against political rivals while identical allegations against members of the ruling coalition are systematically buried.

This political weaponization severely undermines the legitimacy of the entire anti-corruption architecture. When state-level governments bypass the Lokayukta to establish politically subordinate ACBs, they guarantee that high-level corruption remains unchecked. Consequently, empirical data confirms that anti-corruption agencies oriented strictly toward securing criminal convictions are bound to fail in the absence of comprehensive judicial and police reforms. The Lokpal, sitting atop this fractured ecosystem, lacks the independent investigatory manpower to bypass these compromised agencies, forcing it to rely on the very machinery that elite deviants control. Without dismantling these systemic lacunae, the Lokpal

[12] Subramanian Swamy v. Dir., Cent. Bureau of Investigation, (2014) 8 S.C.C. 682 (India).

remains an impotent adjudicator presiding over a rigged investigative apparatus.

CHAPTER - VI

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

The contemporary discourse surrounding the Lokpal and Lokayuktas demands a rigorous paradigm shift. The Indian state must abandon the fallacy that the mere statutory creation of a powerful national ombudsman will spontaneously eradicate corruption. The empirical evidence dictates that anti-corruption strategies must transition from an exclusive reliance on *post-facto* punitive measures (criminal investigation and prosecution) to comprehensive, prophylactic administrative reforms. To salvage the Lokpal framework from symbolic irrelevance, structural modifications must be enacted to insulate the institution from executive sabotage and enhance its operational capacity.

First and foremost, the investigatory and prosecutorial apparatus must be fully decoupled from the political executive. The Lokpal requires its own dedicated, independent investigative directorate, staffed by personnel who are not on deputation from the central government. Relying on the CBI or state police forces—whose career trajectories are controlled by the very politicians they are tasked with investigating—guarantees institutional paralysis. The Lokpal Act must be amended to provide the ombudsman with complete financial and administrative autonomy, akin to the Election Commission of India, securing its operations against vindictive budget cuts or personnel transfers.

Secondly, the statutory shields protecting elite deviants must be dismantled. The requirement for prior sanction under Section 19 of the Prevention of Corruption Act must be entirely excised for high-ranking political executives and Group A bureaucrats. Accountability cannot exist if the accused holds the discretionary power to veto their own prosecution. Simultaneously, the state must heavily fortify its localized accountability mechanisms. The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014, currently languishing in a state of operational limbo, must be vigorously enforced. Protecting the insiders who expose systemic fraud is exponentially more effective than relying on external police raids.[13]

Finally, anti-corruption interventions must adopt sophisticated, sector-specific risk assessment

[13] The Whistle Blowers Protection Act, 2014, No. 17, Acts of Parliament, 2014 (India).

methodologies. Borrowing from international frameworks evaluated in the health sector, the state must implement proactive transparency audits, public expenditure tracking surveys, and digital grievance redressal mechanisms to identify corruption at the point of origin. The Lokpal should not merely act as a criminal court; it must function as a systemic auditor, recommending legislative and administrative alterations to eliminate the discretionary powers that breed graft.

The trajectory of the Lokpal and Lokayuktas Act demonstrates that legal frameworks, however robust on paper, are easily neutralized by entrenched political resistance and structural limitations. Until the Indian legislature guarantees the absolute constitutional entrenchment and unassailable autonomy of these anti-corruption bodies, they will remain ornamental appendages to a compromised system. True democratic accountability necessitates that the law applies with equal ferocity to the apex of the political hierarchy as it does to the common citizen.