



The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 International (CC-BY-NC-SA 4.0) License, which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium provided the original work is properly cited.

CONTRACT LABOUR REGULATIONS

~ *Abhiraj Verma*

ABSTRACT

This article provides an in-depth analysis of contract labour regulations, focusing primarily on the historical evolution, statutory frameworks, and judicial complexities within the Indian legal system. Contract labour presents a perpetual jurisprudential challenge: balancing capital's demand for economic flexibility and operational efficiency with the constitutional mandate to protect marginalized workers from systemic exploitation. The paper traces this trajectory from unregulated pre-independence practices to the watershed enactment of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (CLRA Act). It critically examines the CLRA Act's dual mechanism prohibiting contract labour in core, perennial activities while establishing strict regulatory mandates for welfare amenities, licensing, and wage security in permitted sectors.

Furthermore, the article explores the dynamic role of the Indian judiciary, highlighting the landmark *SAIL* judgment and the evolution of judicial tests used to pierce the veil of "sham" contracts to secure worker regularization. The analysis then evaluates the impending paradigm shift introduced by the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 (OSH Code). While the OSH Code aims to consolidate existing laws and promote the ease of doing business, the paper argues that its increased applicability thresholds and broad exceptions for "non-core" activities risk eroding essential protections for a vast segment of the unorganized workforce. Finally, the article contextualizes these national developments within the broader

global challenge of the digital gig economy, where algorithm-driven platform work mirrors historical contract vulnerabilities and demands innovative regulatory interventions.

INTRODUCTION

The employment of contract labour has become an indelible feature of the contemporary globalized economy. It serves as a fundamental mechanism for industries to manage fluctuating market demands, execute specialized operational tasks, and optimize their overall financial structures. At its core, contract labour involves a complex, tripartite relationship encompassing the principal employer, the intermediary contractor, and the contract workmen themselves. Unlike direct employees who are tethered to the principal employer through a traditional, direct master-servant relationship, contract workers are recruited, supervised, and remunerated by a contractor. This contractor undertakes a contractual obligation to either produce a specified result or supply a requisite quantum of labour for the principal employer's industrial or commercial establishment. While this highly adaptable arrangement provides unparalleled flexibility and profound cost-effectiveness for corporate entities, it simultaneously breeds significant vulnerabilities for the labor force involved. Stripped of the conventional statutory protections, assured job security, and the formidable collective bargaining power that are typically afforded to regular, direct employees, contract workers frequently find themselves relegated to the margins of the industrial ecosystem. They are routinely subjected to precarious working conditions, significantly lower wage structures, and a glaring inadequacy of social security benefits, including health insurance, provident funds, and gratuity. The inherent and historical disparity in bargaining power between capital and labour is thus severely exacerbated in the context of contract employment. This dynamic necessitates the formulation and strict implementation of robust regulatory frameworks to prevent unchecked exploitation and to ensure a modicum of equitable treatment. The regulation of contract labour, therefore, constitutes a perpetual jurisprudential and legislative tightrope walk, striving to strike a delicate, and often heavily contested, balance between the overarching economic imperative of industrial flexibility and the non-negotiable constitutional mandate of social justice. This comprehensive article delves deep into the multifaceted intricacies of contract labour regulations, maintaining a specific, analytical focus on the Indian legal framework. It meticulously traces the historical evolution of these laws, analyzes their substantive statutory provisions, examines pivotal and

transformative judicial interpretations, and critically evaluates the impending paradigm shift being ushered in by the newly codified national labour codes.

THE THEORETICAL UNDERPINNINGS OF CONTRACT LABOUR

From a theoretical standpoint, the utilization of contract labour can be viewed through multiple, often conflicting, economic and sociological lenses. Neoclassical economic theory often champions the contract labour system as a triumph of free-market efficiency, arguing that it allows firms to dynamically adjust their workforce in response to cyclical market fluctuations, thereby reducing fixed overhead costs and maintaining global competitiveness. Conversely, from a Marxist or critical labour perspective, the contract labour system is frequently characterized as an institutionalized mechanism for the 'casualization' of the workforce, designed explicitly to extract surplus value while systematically circumventing the legal obligations, welfare costs, and unionization risks associated with permanent employment. The legal framework governing this domain is effectively a battleground where these competing ideologies clash, resulting in legislation that seeks to accommodate the realities of capitalist enterprise while mitigating its most predatory excesses through state intervention.

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION OF CONTRACT LABOUR IN INDIA

Pre-Independence Exploitation and Early Interventions

The genesis of contract labour regulation in India can be traced directly back to the pre-independence era, a period profoundly characterized by an acute lack of statutory protection for workers and the widespread, systemic exploitation orchestrated by labor intermediaries and contractors. During the early phases of industrialization in India, particularly in the textile, mining, and plantation sectors, the 'jobber' or 'sardar' system was rampant. The Royal Commission on Labour in India, instituted in 1929 and colloquially known as the Whitley Commission, meticulously documented the egregious and inhumane abuses prevalent within the contract labour system in its landmark 1931 report. The Commission highlighted the excessive and arbitrary deductions from the already meager wages of workers, the complete absence of basic sanitary amenities, the dangerously precarious nature of their employment tenure, and the pervasive indebtedness that essentially bonded workers to their contractors. Despite early, high-

level recognition of these systemic and crippling flaws, comprehensive legislative intervention remained frustratingly elusive for several decades, primarily due to the colonial administration's reluctance to impose burdens on industrial capital.

Post-Independence Era and the Drive for Formal Regulation

Following India's independence in 1947, the rapid pace of planned industrialization, coupled with the newly independent democratic state's constitutional commitment to establishing a socialist welfare society, brought the dire plight of contract workers into sharp, unavoidable focus. Various high-level committees, notably including the Bombay Textile Labour Enquiry Committee and the Bihar Labour Enquiry Committee, rigorously analyzed the industrial landscape and consistently reiterated the urgent, unignorable need to either completely abolish or strictly regulate the prevailing contractor system. The turning point in this legal evolution was catalyzed not by the legislature, but by the judiciary. The Supreme Court of India, in the watershed case of *Standard Vacuum Refining Co. of India Ltd. v. Its Workmen* (1960), strongly and unequivocally deprecated the prevalent practice of employing contract labour for perennial, continuous, and core activities of an enterprise. The Court emphasized that such exploitative practices fundamentally violated the core tenets of social justice and fair play enshrined in the Indian Constitution. This definitive judicial pronouncement acted as a powerful catalyst, legally compelling the Indian legislature to enact a dedicated, comprehensive statute to govern the complex dynamics of contract labour. The ensuing exhaustive legislative effort ultimately culminated in the enactment of the Contract Labour (Regulation and Abolition) Act, 1970 (CLRA Act), which, for over half a century, has remained the definitive cornerstone of contract labour jurisprudence in the Indian subcontinent. The primary objective articulated by the CLRA Act was notably not the total, blanket prohibition of contract labour across all sectors, but rather its targeted abolition in specific, unjustifiable circumstances and its rigorous, unyielding regulation in all other permitted contexts, thereby ensuring that contract workers are not entirely stripped of their basic human rights, statutory entitlements, and dignities at the workplace.

THE CONTRACT LABOUR (REGULATION AND ABOLITION) ACT, 1970

Scope, Applicability, and Thresholds

The CLRA Act of 1970 represents a highly structured, comprehensive legislative attempt to mitigate the harsh, unvarnished realities of contract employment. The applicability of the Act is fundamentally determined by specific numerical thresholds, which have been subject to various state-level amendments over the years. Generally, at the central level, the Act applies to every industrial or commercial establishment in which twenty or more workmen are currently employed, or were employed on any single day of the preceding twelve months, specifically as contract labour. Correspondingly, it applies to every contractor who employs, or who employed on any day of the preceding twelve months, twenty or more workmen. The fundamental architecture of the Act operates on a dual, complementary paradigm: first, the total abolition of contract labour in specific, carefully defined processes or operations; and second, the exhaustive regulation of their service conditions, wages, and welfare in areas where abolition is not deemed economically or operationally appropriate by the state.

The Process of Abolition under Section 10

Under the sweeping provisions of Section 10 of the CLRA Act, the appropriate Government (Central or State, depending on the jurisdiction of the establishment) is empowered to explicitly prohibit the employment of contract labour in any process, operation, or other work within any establishment. This formidable executive power is not arbitrary; it is statutorily subject to mandatory prior consultation with the Central or State Advisory Contract Labour Board. The decision-making process involves the compulsory consideration of several critical, legally defined factors. The Government must objectively assess whether the work in question is incidental to, or critically necessary for, the core industry, trade, or business of the establishment; whether it is of a perennial, ongoing nature; whether it is ordinarily done through regular, direct workmen in that specific establishment or an establishment similar thereto; and crucially, whether the quantum of work is sufficient to justify the employment of a considerable number of whole-time, regular workmen. This specific provision embodies the core jurisprudential philosophy that the core, essential, and perennial activities of a profitable enterprise should ideally be performed by regular, secure employees, thereby actively preventing the cynical circumvention of protective labour laws through the veil of disguised, indirect employment.

Registration, Licensing, and Administrative Mechanisms

In scenarios where the employment of contract labour is not explicitly prohibited under Section 10, the CLRA Act establishes a highly stringent, inescapable regulatory regime characterized by mandatory registration and licensing requirements. Every principal employer utilizing contract labour must apply for and obtain a formal certificate of registration for their establishment from the registering officer. Concurrently, every contractor operating within the establishment must secure a valid, government-issued license to execute the specific contract. These administrative prerequisites are emphatically not mere bureaucratic formalities; they serve as a critical, indispensable mechanism for the state apparatus to constantly monitor the deployment of contract labour, track the movement of workers, and rigorously enforce compliance with statutory welfare standards. The failure to obtain the requisite registration or a valid license renders the employment of contract labour entirely illegal and subjects the offending parties both the principal employer and the contractor to severe penal consequences, including fines and potential imprisonment.

Welfare Amenities, Working Conditions and Health

A pivotal and highly detailed aspect of the CLRA Act is its unwavering emphasis on the physical welfare, health, and dignity of contract workers. The Act mandates the compulsory provision of specific, non-negotiable amenities, which contractors are primarily legally responsible for supplying and diligently maintaining. These statutorily mandated facilities encompass adequately furnished canteens (required where one hundred or more contract workers are employed), clean and ventilated rest rooms for overnight stays, a sufficient and accessible supply of wholesome drinking water, hygienic latrines and urinals, and well-equipped first-aid facilities readily accessible during all working hours. Crucially, recognizing the historically precarious economic position of the workers and the frequent insolvency or evasiveness of intermediary contractors, the Act imposes a strict vicarious liability on the principal employer. If the contractor fails to provide these essential amenities within the prescribed, legally binding timeframe, the statutory obligation immediately and automatically devolves upon the principal employer. The principal employer is then legally mandated to supply these facilities and may subsequently, through legal

or commercial means, recover the incurred financial costs from the contractor, either by deducting it from the contractor's bills or as a legally recoverable debt.

Wage Security and the Principal Employer's Liability

The timely and fair payment of wages constitutes another critical, heavily regulated domain meticulously overseen by the CLRA Act. It is established as the absolute, primary responsibility of the contractor to ensure the timely, complete, and unhindered disbursement of wages to all deployed contract workers, strictly conforming to the wage rates officially prescribed under the Minimum Wages Act, 1948. To ensure absolute transparency and to definitively prevent the historical scourge of underpayment and unauthorized deductions, the CLRA Act mandates the physical presence of an authorized, designated representative of the principal employer during the actual disbursement of wages by the contractor. Crucially, the principal employer legally functions as a statutory guarantor of these wages. Under Section 21 of the Act, if the contractor defaults in paying wages, either wholly or partially, or delays payment beyond the stipulated wage period, the principal employer is immediately and legally obligated to step in, make the full necessary wage payments directly to the workers, and subsequently seek indemnification from the contractor. This highly robust, fail-safe mechanism ensures that the ultimate financial burden of ensuring fair and timely remuneration rests squarely with the entity that ultimately derives the economic benefit from the labour provided.

JUDICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS AND EVOLVING JURISPRUDENCE

Piercing the Veil: Sham Contracts and the Quest for Regularization

The interpretation, application, and enforcement of the CLRA Act have predictably generated a voluminous, highly complex body of jurisprudence over the past five decades. Courts across India, culminating in the Supreme Court, have constantly grappled with the intricate complexities of disguised employment and the relentless quest by workers for regularization and job security. A recurring, highly contentious legal issue has been the definitive determination of whether a contract labour arrangement is genuine and legally sound, or merely a 'sham' or 'camouflage' deliberately constructed by the principal employer to illegally evade statutory liabilities and deny workers their rightful benefits. To navigate this, Indian Courts have

meticulously developed and refined various judicial tests to effectively pierce the veil of the contractual arrangement, focusing primarily and intensely on the degree of actual, operational control and supervision directly exercised by the principal employer over the contract workers.

The Sail Judgment: A Watershed Moment

The landmark, Constitution Bench judgment of the Supreme Court of India in Steel Authority of India Ltd. (SAIL) v. National Union Waterfront Workers (2001) fundamentally and irreversibly reshaped the legal landscape governing contract labour. Prior to this definitive ruling, the heavily debated Air India Statutory Corporation case (1996) had controversially held that upon the issuance of an abolition notification by the government under Section 10 of the Act, the existing contract workers would automatically, by operation of law, be absorbed as direct, regular employees of the principal employer. However, the five-judge Constitution Bench in the SAIL case decisively overturned this precedent, ruling unequivocally that an abolition notification under Section 10 does not, under any circumstances, lead to the automatic absorption of contract workers. The Court logically clarified that if the initial contract is found to be genuine and legally valid, the workers' legal relationship is solely and exclusively with the contractor; therefore, abolition simply terminates that specific contractual arrangement, leaving the workers without direct employment. Conversely, the Court held that if the contract is proven through judicial scrutiny to be a 'sham' or 'camouflage' specifically where the principal employer exercises pervasive, direct control over the hiring, firing, and daily activities of the workers the interposing contract is deemed legally invalid. In such cases, the workers are rightfully treated as direct employees of the principal employer from the very inception of their engagement. This highly nuanced legal distinction, while doctrinally sound, undeniably placed a significant and often insurmountable evidentiary burden of proof on the marginalized workers, requiring them to establish the 'sham' nature of the contract through arduous, protracted, and expensive adjudication processes before industrial tribunals.

Refining the Tests of Employment

Post-SAIL, courts have continued to painstakingly refine the specific parameters defining the employer-employee relationship within the context of contract labour. They rigorously scrutinize a multitude of operational factors: who wields the ultimate power of appointment and dismissal;

who actually pays the wages (regardless of the intermediary routing); who determines the specific nature and method of work; who exercises disciplinary control; and who provides the tools and machinery. The traditional 'control test' has increasingly been supplemented by the modern 'integration test', which critically assesses whether the contract workers are fully, seamlessly integrated into the core organizational structure and daily operations of the principal employer's enterprise. Cases such as *International Airport Authority of India v. International Air Cargo Workers' Union* have further solidified these principles. These relentless judicial interventions underscore the Indian judiciary's ongoing commitment to preventing the gross exploitation of vulnerable workers through fraudulent, paper-based contractual schemes, while simultaneously attempting to respect and uphold genuine, bona fide commercial outsourcing arrangements.

THE PARADIGM SHIFT: THE NEW LABOUR CODES

Consolidation and Evolving Thresholds

The established landscape of contract labour regulation in India is currently standing on the precipice of a monumental, historic transformation with the impending, nationwide implementation of the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 (OSH Code). The OSH Code represents a massive, concerted effort by the central government to consolidate, simplify, and heavily modernize decades-old, archaic labour laws, amalgamating several existing enactments including the venerable CLRA Act into a single, unified, and purportedly comprehensive framework. This extensive legislative overhaul is explicitly aimed at facilitating the 'ease of doing business' for corporations while nominally attempting to enhance and streamline the statutory protections available to workers.

A highly prominent and intensely debated feature of the new OSH Code is the significant, upward alteration of the applicability thresholds. The Code substantially raises the numerical threshold for the applicability of its specific contract labour provisions from establishments employing twenty or more contract workers (as under the CLRA Act) to those employing fifty or more. This major recalibration effectively exempts a vast, substantial number of small and medium enterprises (SMEs) entirely from the specific regulatory purview of the contract labour provisions within the Code. While this grants these smaller enterprises significantly greater

operational flexibility in hiring and firing without bureaucratic oversight, it simultaneously leaves a massive segment of the unorganized workforce entirely bereft of the specific, targeted protections previously afforded by the CLRA Act, raising severe alarms among labor unions and human rights advocates.

The Core vs. Non-Core Activities Controversy

Furthermore, the OSH Code formally introduces and crystallizes a crucial statutory distinction between 'core' and 'non-core' activities within an establishment. It explicitly and fundamentally prohibits the employment of contract labour in the core activities of any establishment. However, this prohibition is subject to several broad, loosely defined exceptions, such as sudden, unforeseen increases in the volume of work, activities that do not inherently require full-time, regular workers, or situations where regular employees are temporarily unavailable. While this statutory prohibition theoretically aligns with the longstanding judicial disapproval (dating back to the *Standard Vacuum* case) of using contract labour for perennial tasks, the exceptionally broad phrasing of the statutory exceptions raises profound, widespread concerns. Labour advocates vehemently argue that these exceptions constitute massive legal loopholes that could easily be aggressively exploited by employers to routinely deploy contract workers even in core areas under the guise of 'sudden increases' in work volume, effectively rendering the prohibition toothless in practice.

Licensing Reforms and Migrant Worker Protections

On the administrative front, the OSH Code seeks to significantly streamline the notoriously corrupt and cumbersome bureaucratic process by introducing a single, unified, pan-India license for contractors, effectively replacing the frustrating multiple-licensing regime that previously existed across different states and municipalities. In a highly significant, progressive step aimed at addressing deep-seated inequities, the Code formally aims to address the systemic issue of wage disparity by explicitly mandating that contract workers who are engaged in similar or identical work as direct, regular employees must unequivocally receive equal wages and comparable benefits. Furthermore, acknowledging the stark realities of internal migration, the Code explicitly incorporates mandatory provisions requiring the payment of a lump-sum travel allowance by the contractor to the worker for their annual journey from their native place to the

place of employment, providing much-needed, tangible financial relief for the millions of migrant contract workers traversing the country.

GLOBAL PERSPECTIVES AND THE GIG ECONOMY CHALLENGE

International Labour Organization Standards

The multifaceted challenges surrounding contract labour and precarious employment are by no means unique to India; they resonate profoundly on a global scale, accurately reflecting a much broader, systemic structural shift in the fundamental nature of work and globalized capital. The International Labour Organization (ILO) has consistently and forcefully emphasized the absolute necessity of ensuring 'decent work' for all individuals, regardless of the precise legal taxonomy of their employment relationship. While primary international conventions historically focus on the freedom of association, the right to collective bargaining, and the strict elimination of workplace discrimination, the underlying, unifying principle across ILO instruments (such as the Private Employment Agencies Convention, 1997, No. 181) is the absolute prevention of worker exploitation through precarious, indirect employment arrangements. In many highly developed jurisdictions across Europe and parts of North America, robust, universal social security nets and historically strong union representation mechanisms serve to mitigate the most severe adverse impacts of contract labour to a considerable extent, creating a more balanced industrial relations environment.

The Gig Economy and the Future of Contract Labour

However, the contemporary global discourse on non-standard, indirect employment is increasingly and overwhelmingly dominated by the explosive, unregulated growth of the 'gig economy'. The rapid proliferation of digital platform-based work, heavily characterized by the classification of workers as 'independent contractors', 'freelancers', 'delivery partners', and 'on-demand workers', has severely and irrevocably disrupted traditional, 20th-century employment paradigms. Gig workers, much like traditional contract labourers in the manufacturing sector, frequently operate in a vast, unregulated legal gray area. Because they are legally classified as independent contractors rather than employees, they are systematically excluded from standard, foundational labour protections such as guaranteed minimum wages, mandatory overtime pay,

health insurance, and statutory social security contributions. The modern gig economy essentially amplifies the historical vulnerabilities associated with traditional contract labour; human managers and supervisors are replaced by opaque, unaccountable algorithms, and the corporate illusion of 'entrepreneurial autonomy' frequently masks a state of profound, inescapable economic dependence and insecurity. Regulators, legislatures, and judiciaries worldwide from California's AB5 legislation to the UK Supreme Court's rulings on Uber drivers are currently grappling intensely with the formidable, unprecedented challenge of extending meaningful legal protections and social security to gig workers without entirely stifling technological innovation and platform efficiency. The complex intersection of traditional contract labour regulations and the rapidly emerging, hotly contested legal frameworks for gig and platform workers represents the most critical, defining frontier in modern global labour jurisprudence.

CONCLUSION

The regulation of contract labour remains one of the most intricate, deeply contested, and highly dynamic spheres of industrial and constitutional jurisprudence. The long, fraught journey from the early, dark days of entirely unregulated colonial-era exploitation to the creation of the comprehensive, protective framework of the CLRA Act, and now towards the deeply transformative, consolidated regime of the OSH Code, perfectly reflects a continuous, ongoing societal effort to successfully navigate the aggressively competing demands of economic efficiency, global competitiveness, and fundamental social justice. While the Indian legal framework has historically provided vital, life-saving protections concerning licensing, basic welfare amenities, and fundamental wage security, the actual on-ground enforcement has frequently been severely hampered by chronic systemic inefficiencies, rampant corruption, and the inherent, structural challenges of regulating a massively fragmented, largely unorganized, and highly mobile sector.

The impending implementation of the new national labour codes undeniably presents a massive paradigm shift. It promises vastly streamlined compliance procedures and significantly greater operational flexibility for employers to compete globally, while simultaneously attempting to officially codify essential, long-demanded protections like equal pay for equal work and specific allowances for migrant laborers. However, the true, ultimate efficacy of this entirely new regulatory regime will depend entirely on its rigorous, uncompromised implementation and the proactive, vigilant role of the state apparatus in actively safeguarding the rights of the most vulnerable and marginalized workers at the bottom of the supply chain. Ultimately, a truly sustainable, productive, and equitable industrial ecosystem can only be definitively achieved when the operational flexibility deemed essential for modern business growth is inextricably and legally linked with an absolute, unwavering commitment to the dignity, economic security, and physical well-being of the human workforce that tirelessly drives it.