ISSN: 2582-7219

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

Impact Factor: 8.206

Volume 9, Issue 4, April 2026

www.ijmrset.com ijmrset@gmail.com +91 6381 907 438 +91 63819 07438

© 2026 IJMRSET | Volume 9, Issue 4, April 2026| DOI:10.15680/IJMRSET.2026.0904071

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

A Study on the Role of Fraud Control Units in Preventing Banking Frauds

Anjana Linganagouda Patil

MBA, Department of Management Studies, CMS Business School, JAIN (Deemed-to-be University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT: Banking frauds have emerged as one of the most serious threats to the stability and credibility of financial institutions worldwide. In India, the rapid expansion of digital banking, online transactions, corporate lending, and fintech integration has significantly increased both the scale and complexity of frauds. In response to rising fraud cases, regulatory bodies such as the Reserve Bank of India have mandated banks to establish dedicated Fraud Control Units (FCUs) to strengthen internal vigilance, early detection, and fraud risk mitigation mechanisms.

This study examines the structure, functioning, and effectiveness of Fraud Control Units in preventing and detecting banking frauds. The research explores how FCUs contribute to fraud risk assessment, monitoring suspicious transactions, coordinating with internal audit and compliance teams, and ensuring regulatory reporting. It also evaluates the role of technological tools such as data analytics, artificial intelligence, and early warning systems in enhancing fraud prevention efficiency.

Using a descriptive and analytical research design, the study draws insights from secondary data sources including RBI reports, fraud statistics, and academic literature, along with primary inputs from banking professionals. The findings suggest that proactive monitoring, timely reporting, and integrated risk management frameworks significantly reduce fraud incidence and financial losses. However, challenges such as skill gaps, cyber sophistication, and inter-departmental coordination issues continue to limit optimal performance.

The study concludes that Fraud Control Units are essential pillars of modern banking governance and recommends stronger technological integration, employee training, and real-time fraud analytics systems to further enhance their effectiveness.

I. INTRODUCTION

1. Background of the Study

The banking sector plays a vital role in economic development by mobilizing savings, extending credit, facilitating trade, and supporting investment activities. Trust is the foundation of the banking system. However, the increasing incidence of banking frauds has posed serious challenges to this trust. Fraud not only causes financial losses but also damages the reputation of banks and undermines public confidence.

In recent years, Indian banks have reported significant fraud cases involving loan defaults, cyber-attacks, identity theft, digital payment manipulation, and internal collusion. The digital transformation of banking has created convenience for customers but has simultaneously opened new avenues for financial crimes. As fraudsters adopt sophisticated technological methods, banks must continuously upgrade their fraud prevention frameworks.

Recognizing the gravity of the situation, the Reserve Bank of India has issued comprehensive guidelines requiring banks to implement structured fraud risk management systems. One of the most important developments in this regard is the establishment of Fraud Control Units (FCUs).

2. Concept of Fraud Control Units (FCUs)

Fraud Control Units are specialized internal departments within banks that focus exclusively on fraud prevention, detection, investigation, and reporting. Unlike traditional audit departments that review transactions periodically, FCUs operate continuously and proactively. Their key responsibilities include:

- Monitoring suspicious transactions
- Conducting fraud risk assessments
- Investigating reported fraud cases
- Coordinating with vigilance and compliance departments
- Reporting frauds to regulatory authorities

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)
(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

- Strengthening internal control mechanisms

FCUs function as part of the broader risk management framework and act as the first line of defence against financial irregularities.

3. Need for Fraud Control Units
The need for dedicated Fraud Control Units arises from several factors:
3.1 Increasing Financial Losses
Banking frauds have led to substantial financial losses affecting profitability and shareholder value.
3.2 Technological Complexity
Digital banking platforms, mobile payments, UPI systems, and online lending have increased exposure to cyber frauds.
3.3 Regulatory Pressure
Regulators demand timely detection and reporting of frauds to maintain financial stability.
3.4 Corporate Governance Requirements
Strong internal control systems are essential for maintaining transparency and accountability.

4. Statement of the Problem
Despite regulatory measures and technological advancements, banking frauds continue to rise in terms of frequency and magnitude. While banks have established Fraud Control Units, there is limited empirical research evaluating their actual effectiveness in preventing fraud. This creates a need to systematically study the functioning, performance, and challenges faced by FCUs.

5. Significance of the Study
This study is significant because:
- It provides insights into the operational efficiency of Fraud Control Units.
- It helps banks strengthen fraud prevention strategies.
- It contributes to academic research in risk management and corporate governance.
- It supports policymakers in improving regulatory frameworks.

In a rapidly evolving digital banking environment, understanding the role of Fraud Control Units is crucial for ensuring financial integrity and sustainable banking operations.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Banking fraud has become a serious issue in India and across the world. Many researchers, committees, and institutions have studied why fraud happens and how banks can prevent it. The following literature review explains important studies related to banking fraud, internal controls, fraud risk management, technology, and fraud monitoring systems.

A. Studies on Causes of Banking Fraud
1. Smith (2010) studied fraud cases in commercial banks and found that fraud mostly occurs when internal control systems are weak. If responsibilities are not properly divided and there is no proper supervision, fraud becomes easier.
2. Gupta (2012) examined major loan frauds in Indian banks. The study found that poor credit appraisal, lack of proper verification of documents, and pressure to increase loan disbursement were major reasons behind frauds.
3. Kumar & Sharma (2014) focused on corporate governance. They explained that when the board of directors and senior management fail to monitor activities properly, fraud risk increases.
4. Rao (2015) studied employee fraud and found that many frauds are committed by insiders. The study suggested regular employee background checks and monitoring.
5. ACFE (Association of Certified Fraud Examiners, 2016) in its global report found that internal employees are responsible for a large portion of frauds. It recommended fraud awareness training and strong reporting systems.
6. Joshi (2013) highlighted the importance of forensic accounting in identifying fraud patterns and tracking suspicious transactions.

B. Studies on Fraud Risk Management Systems
7. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (2011) included fraud under operational risk and advised banks to develop the structured risk management systems to prevent financial losses.
8. COSO (2013) introduced a framework for internal control that includes fraud risk assessment. It emphasized that management must regularly identify and assess fraud risks.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

9. Sharma (2016) explained that Enterprise Risk Management (ERM) helps banks detect risks early by integrating all departments under one risk monitoring system.
10. Mehta (2018) studied Indian banks and found that banks with centralized fraud monitoring systems performed better in fraud control compared to decentralized systems.
11. ICAI (2019) provided guidelines for fraud detection and investigation, stressing ethical standards and documentation.

C. Studies on Technology in Fraud Detection
12. Chen (2015) studied data mining techniques and found that advanced data analysis helps in identifying unusual patterns in transactions.
13. Singh (2017) explained that Artificial Intelligence (AI) can detect suspicious activities faster than manual systems.
14. Deloitte (2018) reported that banks using real-time transaction monitoring systems reduced fraud losses significantly.
15. PwC (2019) suggested that predictive analytics helps banks identify high-risk customers and transactions.
16. EY (2021) highlighted that digital forensic tools help investigators gather evidence more effectively.
17. KPMG (2022) found that integrated fraud management systems combining analytics, audit, and compliance are most effective.

D. Regulatory and Institutional Studies
18. Reserve Bank of India (2019 Annual Report) reported increasing fraud cases in Indian banks, especially in loan and digital transactions.
19. RBI (2021 Master Directions on Fraud Risk Management) made it mandatory for banks to establish structured fraud risk management frameworks, including dedicated monitoring units.
20. World Bank (2020) recommended that developing countries should create centralized fraud control departments in banks.
21. SEBI (2020 Enforcement Report) stressed the importance of compliance and vigilance mechanisms in financial institutions.
22. Transparency International (2018) stated that weak institutional controls and corruption increase fraud risks.

E. Studies on Internal Audit and Monitoring Mechanisms
23. Kapoor (2016) found that whistleblower mechanisms encourage employees to report fraud without fear.
24. Verma (2017) studied internal audit systems and concluded that regular audits reduce fraud occurrence.
25. Nair (2020) emphasized that coordination between compliance, audit, and fraud monitoring departments improves fraud detection.
26. Patel (2018) studied vigilance departments in public sector banks and found that timely reporting reduces financial losses.
27. Reddy (2019) explained that fraud monitoring committees improve accountability within banks.

Overall Understanding from Literature
From the above studies, we understand that:
- Weak internal control systems increase fraud risk.
- Loan fraud and employee fraud are major problems in banks.
- Technology like AI, data analytics, and real-time monitoring improves fraud detection.
- Strong risk management systems reduce financial losses.
- Regulators such as the Reserve Bank of India have made fraud risk management compulsory.
- Coordination between audit, compliance, and monitoring departments is essential.

However, most of the studies focus on fraud causes, risk management, or technology separately. Very few studies specifically examine how Fraud Control Units (FCUs) function, how effective they are, and what challenges they face in real banking environments.

This shows the need for a focused study on the role of Fraud Control Units in preventing banking frauds.

RESEARCH GAP
Based on the literature review, the following research gaps are identified:
1. Limited empirical research specifically evaluating the effectiveness of Fraud Control Units in Indian banks.

2. Lack of studies measuring the direct relationship between FCUs and fraud reduction rates.
3. Insufficient focus on technological integration within FCUs.
4. Limited analysis of coordination between FCUs, audit departments, and compliance teams.
5. Absence of structured performance metrics for evaluating FCUs.

This study aims to bridge these gaps by providing a focused and structured assessment of Fraud Control Units in preventing banking frauds.

OBJECTIVES

The present study is conducted with the following objectives:

1. To examine the structure and functioning of Fraud Control Units (FCUs) in commercial banks.

This objective focuses on understanding how FCUs are organized, their roles, responsibilities, reporting structure, and coordination with other departments like audit, compliance, and risk management.

2. To evaluate the effectiveness of Fraud Control Units in preventing and detecting banking frauds.

This objective aims to measure whether FCUs help in reducing fraud cases, minimizing financial losses, and improving early detection systems.

3. To identify the challenges faced by Fraud Control Units in fraud prevention.

This objective focuses on problems such as lack of skilled staff, technological limitations, cyber threats, inter-departmental coordination issues, and regulatory compliance difficulties.

HYPOTHESIS

To examine the role of Fraud Control Units (FCUs) in reducing banking fraud cases, the following hypothesis is formulated:

Null Hypothesis ($H0_1$):

Strengthening of Fraud Control Units (FCUs) has no significant impact on reducing banking fraud cases in India.

Alternative Hypothesis ($H1_1$):

Strengthening of Fraud Control Units (FCUs) has a significant impact on reducing banking fraud cases in India.

The hypothesis is tested using descriptive trend analysis of fraud data before and after the strengthening of Fraud Risk Management guidelines in 2024.

III. METHODOLOGY

This study follows a descriptive research design and is entirely based on secondary data. The objective is to analyze trends in banking fraud cases and assess whether strengthening of Fraud Control Units is associated with reduction in fraud cases in India.

Source of Data

The data has been collected from reliable and publicly available reports of the Reserve Bank of India (RBI), including:

- RBI Annual Reports
- Official fraud statistics releases
- Master Directions on Fraud Risk Management (2024)
- Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India

These sources are considered authentic and credible for analyzing fraud trends in the banking sector.

Period of Study

The study covers the period:

- FY2024 (before revised FCU strengthening)
- FY2025 (after strengthening of FCU framework)
- H1 FY2026 (recent trend observation)

Tools of Analysis

The data has been analyzed using:

- Year-over-Year (YoY) percentage change
- Trend analysis
- Comparative analysis (Pre and Post 2024 framework)
- Tabular presentation

© 2026 IJMRSET | Volume 9, Issue 4, April 2026| DOI:10.15680/IJMRSET.2026.0904071

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

No primary data has been collected, and no inferential statistical tests have been applied. The study focuses on identifying trends and associations rather than proving direct cause-and-effect relationships.

IV. ANALYSIS

Descriptive Data (RBI Data)

Fiscal Year	Number of Fraud Cases	% Change (YoY)	Amount Involved (₹ Crore)	Remarks
FY24	36,060	—	12,230	Before revised Fraud Risk Management Directions
FY25	23,953	-34%	36,014	After 2024 strengthening of FCU framework
H1 FY26	5,092	-72% (vs H1 FY25)	21,515	Continued decline with real-time monitoring

Trend Analysis

1. From FY24 to FY25, fraud cases declined from 36,060 to 23,953, representing a 34% reduction.
2. In H1 FY26, fraud cases further declined to 5,092, showing a 72% year-over-year decline for the half-year.
3. Although the number of cases decreased, the total amount involved increased in FY25, mainly due to:
   - Reclassification of legacy high-value loan fraud cases
   - Reporting of previously undetected large corporate frauds
4. Fraud composition shifted:
   - Digital/card frauds → High number, low value
   - Loan frauds → Lower number, high value

Line Trend Interpretation

If plotted on a line chart:

- A clear downward trend in number of fraud cases is observed after FY24.
- The decline aligns with the strengthening of RBI's Fraud Risk Management Directions (2024), which mandated:
  - Early Warning Systems (EWS)
  - Real-time transaction monitoring
  - Structured Fraud Control Units
  - Improved internal reporting systems

This suggests improvement in early detection and preventive mechanisms.

INTERPRETATION

1. Impact on Fraud Cases

The steady decline in the number of reported fraud cases after FY2024 suggests that monitoring and control mechanisms within banks have improved. The strengthening of Fraud Control Units, along with RBI's revised fraud risk management guidelines, appears to have helped banks:

- Detect suspicious transactions more quickly
- Prevent small digital frauds from increasing
- Improve internal vigilance and reporting systems

This indicates that strengthened FCUs are positively associated with reduction in fraud cases.

2. Increase in Fraud Amount Despite Decline in Cases

Although the number of fraud cases has reduced, the total amount involved increased in FY2025. This can be understood as:

- Reclassification of older high-value loan fraud cases
- Delayed reporting of large corporate frauds
- Improved transparency and better detection of previously hidden frauds

This suggests that detection systems are becoming more effective, even though large-value fraud risk continues to exist.

3. Shift in Fraud Pattern

The data also shows a shift in the type of fraud:

- Digital frauds occur more frequently but involve smaller amounts.
- Loan frauds occur less frequently but involve large financial losses.

This means that while FCUs may be effective in reducing the overall number of fraud cases, stronger controls may still be needed to prevent high-value corporate loan frauds.

Overall Interpretation

Based on the descriptive trend analysis, there is a clear reduction in fraud cases after the strengthening of the FCU framework. The timing of this decline aligns with the implementation of RBI's revised fraud management guidelines. Therefore, the findings support the view that strengthening of Fraud Control Units is associated with improved fraud prevention in Indian banks. However, since the study is based only on secondary data and descriptive analysis, the results indicate association rather than direct causation.

V. CONCLUSION

This study examined the role of Fraud Control Units (FCUs) in preventing banking frauds in India using secondary data from FY2020 to FY2025. The analysis shows that the number of fraud cases has declined after the strengthening of Fraud Risk Management guidelines by the Reserve Bank of India in FY2024. This suggests that structured monitoring systems, Early Warning Systems (EWS), and real-time fraud detection mechanisms have helped banks improve fraud prevention.

However, even though the number of fraud cases has reduced, the total amount involved in fraud cases remains high in some years due to large-value loan frauds and previously unreported cases. This indicates that while Fraud Control Units are effective in controlling the frequency of frauds, there is still a need to focus more on preventing high-value and complex financial frauds.

Overall, Fraud Control Units play an important role in strengthening internal controls, improving transparency, and maintaining public trust in the banking system. Continuous improvement in technology, employee training, and regulatory monitoring is necessary to deal with evolving fraud risks.

VI. SCOPE FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

The present study focuses only on secondary data and overall fraud trends. Future research can explore the following areas:

1. A comparative study between public and private sector banks to understand differences in FCU effectiveness.
2. A detailed study on cyber fraud and digital payment fraud prevention.
3. The role of Artificial Intelligence and machine learning in fraud detection.
4. A cost-benefit analysis of setting up and maintaining Fraud Control Units.
5. A study on employee awareness and training related to fraud prevention.
6. Cross-country comparison of fraud control systems and regulatory frameworks.
7. In-depth analysis of high-value corporate loan fraud cases.

These areas can provide deeper understanding and practical suggestions to further strengthen fraud prevention mechanisms in the banking sector.

REFERENCES

1. Reserve Bank of India. (2019). Annual report 2018–19. Reserve Bank of India.
2. Reserve Bank of India. (2020). Annual report 2019–20. Reserve Bank of India.
3. Reserve Bank of India. (2021). Annual report 2020–21. Reserve Bank of India.
4. Reserve Bank of India. (2022). Annual report 2021–22. Reserve Bank of India.
5. Reserve Bank of India. (2023). Annual report 2022–23. Reserve Bank of India.
6. Reserve Bank of India. (2024). Master directions on fraud risk management in commercial banks. Reserve Bank of India.

ISSN: 2582-7219 | www.ijmrset.com | Impact Factor: 8.206| ESTD Year: 2018|

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research in Science, Engineering and Technology (IJMRSET)

(A Monthly, Peer Reviewed, Refereed, Scholarly Indexed, Open Access Journal)

7. Reserve Bank of India. (n.d.). Report on trend and progress of banking in India. Reserve Bank of India.
8. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2006). Sound practices for the management and supervision of operational risk. Bank for International Settlements.
9. Basel Committee on Banking Supervision. (2011). Principles for the sound management of operational risk. Bank for International Settlements.
10. Committee of Sponsoring Organizations of the Treadway Commission. (2013). Internal control – integrated framework. COSO.
11. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners. (2022). Report to the nations on occupational fraud and abuse. ACFE.
12. Institute of Chartered Accountants of India. (2019). Guidance note on fraud reporting and prevention. ICAI.
13. World Bank. (2020). Financial sector fraud risk and governance report. World Bank.
14. Securities and Exchange Board of India. (2020). Enforcement report. SEBI.
15. Deloitte. (2018). India banking fraud survey. Deloitte Insights.
16. PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2019). Global economic crime and fraud survey. PwC.
17. Ernst & Young. (2021). Global forensic data analytics survey. EY.
18. KPMG. (2022). Fraud risk management in financial services. KPMG.
19. Smith, R. (2010). Internal control weaknesses and bank fraud. Journal of Banking Regulation, 11(3), 210–225.
20. Gupta, S. (2012). Loan frauds in Indian banking: Causes and preventive measures. Finance India, 26(4), 1021–1035.
21. Joshi, M. (2013). Role of forensic accounting in fraud detection. Indian Journal of Accounting, 44(2), 67–74.
22. Kumar, P., & Sharma, R. (2014). Corporate governance and fraud risk in banking sector. International Journal of Finance and Policy Analysis, 6(1), 45–59.
23. Rao, V. (2015). Insider fraud in commercial banks: A study of risk factors. Journal of Risk Management, 9(2), 88–101.
24. Chen, H. (2015). Data mining techniques for financial fraud detection. International Journal of Data Science, 8(3), 120–135.
25. Sharma, R. (2016). Enterprise risk management practices in Indian banks. Journal of Risk Governance, 12(2), 45–60.
26. Kapoor, A. (2016). Effectiveness of whistleblower policies in financial institutions. Corporate Governance Review, 14(3), 73–89.
27. Verma, S. (2017). Internal audit systems and fraud reduction. Indian Accounting Review, 51(1), 33–48.
28. Singh, A. (2017). Artificial intelligence in fraud detection systems. Journal of Banking Technology, 5(1), 33–41.
29. Patel, D. (2018). Vigilance mechanisms in public sector banks. Banking and Finance Law Review, 22(2), 150–167.
30. Mehta, K. (2018). Centralized fraud monitoring in Indian banks. Asian Journal of Financial Research, 10(4), 98–112.
31. Reddy, S. (2019). Role of fraud monitoring committees in Indian banks. Journal of Governance and Ethics, 7(2), 115–129.
32. Nair, L. (2020). Coordination between compliance and fraud monitoring units. Journal of Financial Regulation and Compliance, 28(3), 401–417.
33. Transparency International. (2018). Corruption perceptions index report. Transparency International.

INNO SPACE

SJIF Scientific Journal Impact Factor

INTERNATIONAL STANDARD SERIAL NUMBER INDIA

निस्केयर NISCAIR

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH IN SCIENCE, ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY

| Mobile No: +91-6381907438 | Whatsapp: +91-6381907438 | ijmrset@gmail.com |

www.ijmrset.com