Journal of Advances and Scholarly Researches in Allied Education
Vol. 19, Issue No. 3, April-2022, ISSN 2230-7540

A Study on Protection and Prevention of Labour Laws in India: Judicial Trends

Mahipal Singh Lamror*

Assistant professor, Government Law College, Ajmer

Abstract - ***As of now, Indian labour law reform is a hot-button issue in the country. We're all aware that labour regulations in India now impose rigidity on the country's economy, which has an adverse effect on our progress. Despite the fact that Indian labour rules are extensive, complicated and often confusing, they encourage litigation rather than resolving industrial relations difficulties. A number of unions have protested against proposed changes to labour and industrial regulations, claiming that they were developed without their input and that the changes favor companies over workers. The government argues the changes are necessary for the growth of our country. As a result, this study looks at the sluggish pace of changes in India's workforce and their impact on the economy as a whole. Policy gridlock on labour reforms has prevented the nation from reaping demographic benefits. In terms of luring international investors or enticing local businesses to build industrial facilities, irregular changes in labour rules have been mostly ineffective. The paper covers the current government's efforts to implement labour reforms in India, as well as the need for such changes in the country.***

Keywords - Courts, Labour Rights, Labour reforms, Labour Laws, Trade Union

----------X----------

INTRODUCTION

Both the Indian state's support for labour, and the long-term influence of the Indian union movement, would seem to indicate that India's labour laws have protected workers against business interests, but this issue has been debated for decades, as we noted before. Trade unionists and labour law scholars in India have long argued that the Indian labour law framework and how it operates are extremely restrictive and, at times, even repressive of labour and its representative institutions, dating back at least to the 1920s and the wartime legislation of the 1940s and beyond. To be sure, there is a slew of laws aimed at establishing a foundation of minimal rights for workers in all sectors and vocations in India. What do we make of these two seemingly contradictory views? Some of this legal framework may be summarized at this point.

The Factories Act of 1948, the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act of 1970, and several Shops and Commercial Establishments Acts are all part of the first set of laws. Keeping employees safe and healthy is the primary goal of the Factories Act. It specifies the cleaning and sanitization of industries, as well as the hours of labour, overtime, and yearly leave, as well as required rest days. Women and children are given particular consideration under the Act when it comes to their working circumstances. The Factories Act exemplifies Indian labour law's dense regulation, a crucial aspect of the system. As an example, the Act sets forth a minimum number of square feet of workplace for each employee and specifies the way in which regulated facilities are cleaned and painted. Non-powered manufacturing facilities that employ 20 or more people are also covered by the Act. The Act is applicable to all manufacturing facilities that utilize electricity and employ 10 or more workers.

It is the purpose of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act to both ban and control the employment of contract labour in various sectors. The 'relevant government' (Central or State) may, under the rules of the Act, restrict the use of contract labour in a sector, following a regulated method laid forth in the law. When it comes to employment in mines, railroads, and port facilities, the Central government prohibits the use of such labour. In addition to establishing different health and safety safeguards, the Act controls other aspects of employment, such as compensation, hours worked, overtime, and other types of leave.

THE PROTECTION OF LABOUR RIGHTS

As a complement to the federal government's Factories Act, the Shops and Commercial Establishments Acts are a collection of state-level statutes that oversee the operation of small enterprises such as restaurants, motels and amusement facilities like movie theatres. Specific exemptions from the Act include the government's offices, public utilities such as electricity and water, and medical facilities. Aside from various health and safety-related regulations, the Acts control the hours of work and salary rates as well as paid vacations

and rest days. It's possible to rate the effectiveness of these laws based on how much difference there is between them.

Also worth mentioning are the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulations Act 1986), which outlawed the use of children in certain operations and imposed stringent restrictions on the conditions under which children could be employed; and the Bonded Labour System (Abolition) Act 1976, which sought to abolish and restore the practice of forced labour by putting in place strict enforcement measures.

Four pieces of law are relevant to the topic of Wages and Remuneration. Among the most important laws in the United States, the Minimum Pay Act of 1948 mandates that the relevant government, whether federal or state, establish minimum wages for particular kinds of work or businesses. There is no minimal need for the Act to take effect in order for it to include a large number of people, hence it has a broad reach. Like other applicable labour standards, however, the law is restricted by reference to the forms of work specified in the legislation and schedule of the Act. The timetable includes industries ranging from carpet and shawl weaving to mines, plantations, grain mills, tanneries, and public transportation. In addition, several State changes add and remove businesses and professions from the list of industries and occupations covered. Even within the same industry, there are significant differences in wage rates. The minimum wage in rural locations is often lower than the minimum wage in metropolitan areas. Indian labour laws are notoriously complicated, and this legislation's assessment of minimum wage rates follows suit. The bare minimum is divided into two parts a base rate and additional stipends to account for regional variations in the cost of living.

The Payment of Wages Act of 1936 is a second key regulation. Unauthorized deductions from employees' pay by employers in the form of penalties and fines were a major issue in Indian labour relations at the time this law was passed, and it was intended to address that issue. As a starting point, the Act was only applicable to major companies and railroads, and only within a specific salary cap. It has now been expanded to cover additional industries, but the pay cap has remained the same.

The Payment of Bonus Act 1965, which allows for the payment of a yearly bonus (the amount of which is stipulated in the law) to all workers earning salaries below a defined ceiling, is another important wage-related regulation. Almost all states have this law, although it only applies to certain businesses with at least 20 employees. The Equal Remuneration Act of 1976 mandates equal pay for men and women who do the same job, however it is only applicable to businesses that employ 10 or more individuals.

The Employees' State Insurance Act 1948, the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 1952, and the Employees' Compensation Act 1923 are the three primary sets of rules providing for different sorts of security and welfare benefits.

A new Employees' State Insurance Scheme, which covers employees for illness, occupational accident or disability, and maternity in addition to death payments for dependents, was implemented under this legislation. Employer and employee payments are used to fund the program, with state-funded medical institutions providing the rest. Only factories and other facilities employing at least 20 people are eligible for the program, which is available in almost every state except for seasonal professions.

The second legislative requirement has resulted in three main retirement and death benefit programs for employees and their families. The Employees' Provident Fund was first established under the Act, which required both employers and employees to pay. The concept is widely used in the majority of states, however it is limited by the kind of industry and the size of the business (those employing 20 workers or more). It does not apply to government personnel or those who earn more than a certain amount. The Deposit-Linked Insurance Plan of 1976 and the Employees' Pension Plan of 1995 were both later implemented as a result of this law.

One of the first pieces of labour reform legislation brought into India after World War One was the Employees' Compensation Act 1923. It was aimed to improve industrial safety standards and was influenced by the newly founded International Labour Organization (ILO). Workplace accidents that result in the death or injury of an employee must be compensated by the employer under this law, except in cases where an employee's use of alcohol or drugs or a disdain for safety measures is directly responsible to the employee's actions. This regulation applies to regular workers as well as individuals who work part-time, on a contract basis, or as temporary employees. However, as we have shown, implementation of this regulation is weak in the unorganised and organized sectors of the economy.

EMPLOYMENT SECURITY

Two further pieces of legislation need mention. The Maternity Benefit Act of 1961 offers both prenatal and postnatal leave and salary compensation for female workers, as well as maternity leave. Workers employed in factories, mines, and plantations, as well as those employed in commercial businesses, are covered by the system. However, the Employees' State Insurance Scheme does not apply to enterprises already covered by this program. Those workers who have reached the stage of retirement, resignation, or death are entitled to an extra payment in the form of a gratuity under the Payment of Gratuity Act 1972. Entitlements are only

available to employees who have worked for a minimum of five years and to businesses that employ at least 10 people.

For all intents and purposes, this large body of labour legislation reflects a system that is very favorable to the interests of working people. For the most part, it conforms technically to international norms when it comes to workplace safeguards. According to the labour and independent watchdogs, the true worth of labour laws to employees has been a long-standing issue for decades. It is self-evident that more investigation is required to make sense of these seeming contradictions.

Data utilized by researchers investigating the probable relationship between a country's 'legal origins' and the strength of its labour regulations provides one area of inquiry. Regulation of alternative employment contracts, working hours, dismissal, employee representation (including union registration and collective bargaining) and industrial action are only a few of the many factors considered in this study.

Deakin, Lele, and Siems found that India's labour law system was the third most protective among the five countries they studied, ahead of the United States and the United Kingdom, but behind the German and far behind the French systems – and that position remained largely stable throughout the study period (1970–2005). The same coding system was employed by another group of authors, who included Australia and New Zealand in their analysis. They found that India ranked higher than both of these countries in terms of the strength of their labour law protections, and that position remained largely stable throughout all of that period, with the exception of New Zealand, which was surveyed from about 1974 until the early 1990s. Since all five nations with a common law tradition were included, Indian employment legislation stands out as being the most protective. It also rates extremely close to Germany's, which is often regarded one of the most worker-friendly capitalist governments. These findings add credence to an idea that the Indian government's 'corporatist' approach of economic and labour market regulation in the late 1940s and early 1950s was significantly labour-protective. Several factors, however, point to the need for a more nuanced interpretation of such a judgment, even if it is not wholly erroneous.

Indian labour laws are substantially different from their counterparts in other countries when compared to those in other countries using similar data but at lower levels of sub-aggregation. According to our findings, Indian law is very labour-protective, scoring above all six other countries assessed on dismissal, and above all four other common law-derived nations surveyed in respect to alternative employment contracts. This evidence suggests, therefore, that Indian labour legislation, at least among common law nations, but potentially beyond, is very labour-protective.

However, when collective labour rights are taken into consideration, the picture changes dramatically. Even while India's relative position in relation to other common law countries has fluctuated during the survey period, it has been comparatively stroppy in comparison to France and Germany, who have a more labour-oriented system.

INFLUENCE OF TRADE UNIONS IN THE INDIAN POLITICAL ECONOMY

If labour unions were able to use political and industrial strength to exert influence in Indian politics, as we have shown, this has been a common motif in Indian literature. However, based on the information presented above, it appears that workers have been better protected from the interests of corporations because the government has used legislation to create an individual floor of rights rather than collective rights exercised through unions and collective bargaining. This finding is in line with that of numerous authorities.

Research on Indian labour law that uses leximetric methods has verified this conclusion. Sarkar found that just nine of the 40 factors in the Deakin, Lele, and Siems research changed significantly between 1970 and 2006 in a study on the influence of Indian labour legislation on unemployment. Of the nine, eight were linked to a strengthening of the legislation safeguarding employees in circumstances of agency labour, individual and collective dismissals, and reinstatement. That is to say, the most significant shifts in the field of labour law have occurred in the areas of individual rights and disciplinary action. Dougherty's study utilizing OECD Employment Outlook data shows that India's Federal-level labour rules are tighter (more onerous on employers) than almost other OECD nations when it comes to regular contracts and collective dismissals (as at 2007).

That's based on all of this data, which shows that the Indian state has always favored a firm foundation of wide-ranging worker rights when dealing with companies. However, there are still issues being debated that raise doubts about the legitimacy as well as the usefulness of this strategy. Leximetric coding has the drawback of making it difficult to determine the impact of the laws being studied because it relies heavily on formal qualities, as was the case when we used the Deakin, Lele, and Siems data for India in this discussion. This was the case when we used the 'leximetric' coding method. This technique, however, has been shown to give very deceptive results, therefore other elements that may undermine the integrity of Indian labour legislation should be taken into account.

One of these considerations is the fact that India's different labour regulations are only applied to a small portion of the country's economy. Much earlier protective protections only applied to a tiny percentage of workplaces, as we've shown, and this

trend has persisted through the majority of current labour legislation. Although the Supreme Court has construed the term industry rather liberally, the definition of workmen excludes government officials, agricultural labourers, and domestic staff from coverage under the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947. Throughout the 1990s and beyond, more than half of the Indian workforce was still working in agriculture. Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act 1946 also only applies to companies with 100 or more workers, however in certain jurisdictions these restrictions have been expanded to companies with 50 or more employees. There are a number of regulations that restrict their applicability based on the size of a company or other factors. For the most part, industrial establishments in India employ fewer people than required by law.

Additionally, the overall economic structure of India is problematic. On the unorganized (informal) economy, the majority of Indians work in self-employment and casual wage jobs. However, in metropolitan areas, the majority of these jobs are still held by domestic workers and servants, as well as other menial services. A movement in employment has occurred during the 1990s, from organized to unorganized industries. Only 27 million people labour in the private sector that is organized. Between 1991 and 2006, the public sector lost 870,000 employees. A growing number of people are working as contractors, or those who have a legal connection with their employer that is unclear, inside the formal economy. The number of people who are protected by India's labour laws would undoubtedly decline as a result of each of these changes. In addition, many employees in the formal sector may still be unprotected by the law. Almost 395 million people were employed in the informal economy in India in 2005, according to Sankaran's estimates. Of those employed in the official sector, only 53% were really protected by the labour rules, with the other 47% categorized as informal work. According to various estimates, more than 90 percent of the workforce is not covered by the legislation.

Another problem is whether or not to enforce or avoid. Even though the law is applied in theory, that is to say, in formal terms, it is readily disregarded or evaded, and therefore its implications are rendered null and invalid. Even in the organized sector, there are several methods in which businesses may and do circumvent labour regulations. If a major company is divided up into smaller divisions that are not covered by the law, or if it is acquired or merged, employees may be left with little or no protection under retrenchment laws or health and safety rules. A way around the retrenchment regulations is via the employment of so-called voluntary retirement programs, which are frequently not really voluntary. As a result, several enterprises have simply relocated to places where regulation is less strict. However, as we have already shown, enforcement is inadequate in every part of the world. Obviously, this situation has a significant impact on Indian labour law's protective image. Among the data presented is that most employees do not get the legally mandated minimum wage and that legislation intended to govern working hours, health and safety, etc., is disregarded or not implemented. Despite the Contract Labour Act's stated goal, several of India's most vital sectors use contract labour.

While Indian labour laws may seem to be 'protective,' when examined throughout the Indian economy, they are ineffectual. There is still a popular belief that Indian labour law's excessive protection has played a significant role in the seeming inability of India's formal economy to adapt to and flourish in the globalized world economy, particularly the formal sector. Studies have focused on the economic ramifications of the legislative changes made in the 1970s and 1980s, which, as previously said, strengthened employment rights for employees employed by bigger businesses. In 1976, the insertion of Chapter VB into the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, in particular, created strict provisions prohibiting layoffs and retrenchments in companies with more than 300 employees.

These changes, according to research by Fallon and Lucas, Nagaraj, and Bhalotra, were linked to a decrease in the demand for labour, which in turn slowed employment growth, even as the economy grew and productivity grew. For example, Fallon and Lucas found that the 1976 amendment to the Labour Code was associated with a 17.6% decline in manufacturing employment across the sectors studied from 1959/60 to 1981/82, and that this decline was not accompanied by an increase in employment in smaller firms exempted from the law's coverage. The findings of a subsequent investigation by the same researchers were almost identical. The Fallon and Lucas investigations were not the only ones to find that India's job security legislation had a detrimental impact on employment. Other studies, however, used alternative reasoning to support their findings.

Indian labour law has been studied in more depth by other researchers. According to an analysis by Besley and Burgess, key state amendments to the Industrial Disputes Act 1947, such as strikes and lockouts, the adjudication of industrial dispute resolution, the closure of companies, layoffs and retrenchments, negotiations and union membership, were classified as pro-worker or 'pro-employer.'. The research concluded that those Indian States that had implemented proworker reforms had seen much poorer growth in production, employment, and investment, as well as worse productivity, as compared to States that had not. There were also considerable increases in employment in the unregistered sector and urban poverty in those states that had implemented pro-worker changes, according to their findings.

As a methodological study, there has been significant criticism of the Besley and Burgess study.

However, it has served as the basis for much later empirical research. Legal changes that are pro-employer have been shown to lead to more employment and production growth than reforms that are pro-worker, according to this research. De-licensing and tariff reforms, for example, will be more successful if they are accompanied by changes to labour legislation that are favorable to employers. Ahsan and Pages' research, instead of aggregating all labour law limitations, has examined for the potential of a differential influence of job security and dispute resolution rules. This study indicated that improvements in both areas of labour law had a detrimental impact on both employment and production. In addition, the study found that stricter job security regulations had a greater negative impact when enacted at the state level since they increased the expenses of resolving industrial disputes.

So, there is evidence, however debated, that the perceived rigidities in the Indian labour law system had, and continue to have, detrimental effects for the growth of the Indian economy. Even in the formalized areas of the economy there are legitimate concerns about the efficacy, as we stated, of most of India's labour market regulation. In addition, research is often restricted in scope and its findings are open to argument or disagreement.

CONCLUSION

India is a quasi-industrialized society, which means that it is still developing its industry. Even while the country's economy is booming, it hasn't yet begun to industrialize in the manner some had hoped after independence. A discussion on labour law that includes significant countries like China, India, Indonesia, and so on will not be possible if we restrict the scope of the debate to the United States alone. We should not assume that emerging nations will follow the same path as their predecessors when it comes to industrialization. In order to find out what exactly is'regulating' 'labour' in India, additional examination by labour attorneys is required.

The unique social protection efforts now being implemented in India are one such suggestion for a research direction. These include the Mahatma Ghandi ational Rural Employment Guarantee Scheme, which is designed to provide a minimum income through a right-to-work guarantee to those who are the poorest, and the Unorganized Sector Workers' Social Security Bill 2008, which is intended to eventually extend a social welfare network of schemes to the 60 million or so workers in the unorganized sectors of the economy. It is unusual for these sorts of rules and regulations to be discussed in the context of labour law; they are usually placed in the background, if at all. In spite of this, research on Indian labour law implies that we should take a multifaceted strategy to labour regulation. Something else is relevant to the situation of labour when formal or conventional conceptions of labour law are ineffectual or irrelevant. Indian customs, caste, religion, and class all play a significant role when it comes to deciding workers' rights and the safeguards they get. As a result, a new strategy is needed.

REFERENCES

1. N. Bose, “Indian Labour Code”, Eastern Law House, Calcutta, 1950.
2. S. Cooney, T. Lindsey, R. Mitchell and Y. Zhu (eds.), “Law and Labour Market Regulation in East Asia”, Routledge, London, 2002.
3. G. Davidov and B. Langille (eds.), “The Idea of Labour Law”, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
4. P. Garibaldi, A.V. Jose and K.R. Shyam Sundar, “Labour Regulation, Labour Flexibility and Labour Reforms in Europe: Some Perspectives with Possible Lessons for India”, Institute for Studies in Industrial Development, New Delhi, 2008.
5. International Labour Organization, “Organization, Bargaining and Dialogue for Development in a Globalizing World”, Governing Body, 279th Session, Geneva, 2000.
6. G. M. Kothari and A. G. Kothari, “A Study of Industrial Law”, Vols. 1 and 2, N. M. Tripathi Private Limited, Bombay, 4th edition, 1987.
7. D. Banerjee, “Labour Regulation and Industrial Development in West Bengal”, Institute for Studies in Industrial Development, New Delhi, 2008.
8. Labour Bureau, “India Labour Year Book”, Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, New Delhi, 2004.
9. S. Malik, P. L. Malik, “Industrial Law”, Vols. I and II, Eastern Book Co., Lucknow, 23rd edition, 2011
10. Amjad, “Labour Legislation and Trade Unions in India and Pakistan”, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2001.
11. Ahsan, “Labour Regulations in India: Impact and Policy Reform Options”, World Bank, New Delhi, 2006.
12. J. Ahluwalia, “Productivity and Growth in Indian Manufacturing”, Oxford University Press, Delhi, 1991.

Corresponding Author

Mahipal Singh Lamror*

Assistant professor, Government Law College, Ajmer