

The background of the journal cover features a top-down view of a desk. On the left, a pair of black leather brogue shoes is partially visible. In the center, an open notebook with lined pages and a silver pen lies on a light-colored wooden surface. To the right, a black leather bag with a zipper and a black leather watch with a silver dial are also visible. A large, semi-transparent white rectangular box is centered over the image, containing the journal's title and ISSN information.

INTERNATIONAL LAW  
JOURNAL

---

**WHITE BLACK  
LEGAL LAW  
JOURNAL**  
**ISSN: 2581-  
8503**

*Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal*

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

[WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN](http://WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN)

## DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

## ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

*White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

## AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

# **IMPACT OF THE POSH ACT ON WORKPLACE CULTURE AND EMPLOYEE SAFETY**

AUTHORED BY - JOSHUA PRAVEEN KUMAR S

School of Law, Vels Institute of Science, Technology and Advanced Studies (VISTAS),  
Chennai

CO-AUTHOR - MS. R. GOWRI SHANKARI,

Assistant Professor, Department of Legal Studies, School of law. VISTAS

## **Abstract**

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (hereinafter 'the POSH Act')<sup>1</sup> represents one of the most significant legislative milestones in Indian gender jurisprudence. Enacted against the backdrop of the Supreme Court's Vishaka Guidelines,<sup>2</sup> the statute imposes concrete obligations on employers to prevent, prohibit, and redress incidents of sexual harassment across organised and unorganised workplaces alike. This article examines the Act's impact on workplace culture and employee safety through a doctrinal and analytical lens. It traces the historical evolution of the law, unpacks its constitutional foundations,<sup>3</sup> and critically evaluates implementation challenges — particularly in the informal sector. The article further situates India's framework within the global normative architecture established by CEDAW,<sup>4</sup> the ILO, and comparative national models. It concludes with targeted recommendations aimed at bridging the persistent gap between legislative intent and on-the-ground practice.

**Keywords:** *POSH Act, Sexual Harassment, Workplace Safety, Internal Committee, Vishaka Guidelines, Gender Equality, Informal Sector.*

## **I. Introduction**

Workplace sexual harassment is simultaneously a violation of individual dignity and a structural impediment to women's equal participation in economic life. In India, where nearly half the female workforce is engaged in the unorganised sector, the legal architecture governing this phenomenon carries enormous practical consequence. The

POSH Act<sup>5</sup> fills a legislative void that had long been addressed only through judicial direction. Before 2013, India relied almost entirely on the guidelines issued by the Supreme Court in *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*,<sup>6</sup> a judgment that arose from the gang rape of Bhanwari Devi, a social worker in Rajasthan, while she was discharging her official duties. That tragedy catalysed a recognition that the absence of a safe workplace is not merely an administrative failure but a denial of fundamental constitutional rights.

This article proceeds in seven parts. Part II surveys the historical and constitutional background. Part III analyses the architecture of the POSH Act, with particular attention to its complaint mechanisms. Part IV identifies implementation deficits. Part V situates the Indian framework within international law. Part VI draws comparisons with the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia. Part VII offers conclusions and reform proposals.

## **II. Historical and Constitutional Background**

### **2.1 Pre-1997 Legal Vacuum**

Prior to 1997, no dedicated statute or codified rule specifically prohibited sexual harassment at the workplace in India. The Indian Penal Code addressed isolated criminal acts — assault, stalking, and obscene gestures — but contained no provision that recognised the systemic, relational dynamics of workplace harassment. Women who experienced such conduct faced the unenviable choice of absorbing the harm silently or resigning. The structural power imbalances that typically characterise harassment meant that the latter option was rarely viable without significant professional and financial cost.

### **2.2 Vishaka and the Judicial Intervention**

The Supreme Court's decision in *Vishaka*<sup>7</sup> transformed the legal landscape. Invoking Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution,<sup>8</sup> the Court held that sexual harassment at the workplace violates women's fundamental rights to equality, non-discrimination, and dignified life. In the absence of legislation, the Court issued a set of binding guidelines requiring every employer to: (i) expressly prohibit sexual harassment; (ii) establish a Complaints Committee headed by a woman; (iii) provide awareness training; and (iv) include third-party harassment within the ambit of employer responsibility. These guidelines, while path-breaking, were judicially crafted norms rather than a parliamentary enactment. They carried no penal sanction for non-compliance and depended entirely on the willingness of

employers to self-regulate.

Subsequent judgments reinforced the Vishaka framework. In *Apparel Export Promotion Council v A K Chopra*,<sup>9</sup> the Supreme Court held that sexual harassment need not culminate in physical contact to attract legal consequences; conduct that violates a woman's dignity is sufficient. In *Medha Kotwal Lele v Union of India*,<sup>10</sup> the Court directed all state governments to implement the Vishaka guidelines faithfully, acknowledging that compliance remained patchy more than a decade after the original judgment.

### **2.3 From Guidelines to Statute: The POSH Act, 2013**

Sustained advocacy by women's rights organisations, escalating media coverage of harassment cases, and India's international obligations — particularly under CEDAW<sup>11</sup> — generated irresistible legislative momentum. The POSH Act was enacted in April 2013, converting the Vishaka Guidelines into a comprehensive statutory instrument. Three features mark its departure from its predecessor: the introduction of criminal-adjacent penalties for non-compliant employers, the explicit inclusion of the unorganised sector, and the creation of district-level Local Complaints Committees (LCCs) as a safety net for workers who cannot access an Internal Committee.

## **III. Architecture of the POSH Act**

### **3.1 Definition of Sexual Harassment**

The Act defines sexual harassment broadly to encompass physical contact and advances, demands or requests for sexual favours, sexually coloured remarks, display of pornography, and any other unwelcome physical, verbal, or non-verbal conduct of a sexual nature. This residual category is jurisprudentially significant: it acknowledges that harassment is dynamic and cannot be exhausted by enumeration alone. The definition captures quid pro quo harassment — where compliance is tied to employment benefits — as well as hostile environment harassment, where pervasive conduct renders the workplace professionally untenable.

### **3.2 The Internal Committee (IC)**

Every employer with ten or more employees is obligated to constitute an Internal Committee. The IC must be chaired by a senior female employee; at least one member must be an external expert — typically a lawyer, social worker, or representative of a non-

governmental organisation — whose presence is intended to provide independence and guard against institutional bias. This structural safeguard addresses a well-documented concern: that purely internal bodies tend to protect organisational reputation over victim welfare.<sup>12</sup>

On receipt of a written complaint, the IC must complete its inquiry within ninety days. The inquiry is quasi-judicial in character: both parties have the right to be heard, cross-examination is permitted, and the IC's findings must be communicated to the employer with specific recommendations for action. The employer is bound to implement the IC's recommendations within sixty days.

### **3.3 The Local Complaints Committee (LCC)**

Recognising that a large proportion of working women are employed in settings where a formal IC is impractical — domestic households, agricultural fields, construction sites, micro-enterprises — the Act mandates the constitution of LCCs at the district level. Chaired by a senior official nominated by the district officer, and including civil society representation, the LCC functions as a public complaints redressal mechanism for workers in the informal economy and in establishments with fewer than ten employees. Despite its progressive design, the LCC's effectiveness is severely constrained by low awareness and inadequate outreach.

### **3.4 Employer Obligations and Penalties**

Beyond establishing the IC, employers must: display the penal consequences of sexual harassment prominently in the workplace; conduct awareness programmes at regular intervals; include POSH compliance in annual reports; and provide appropriate assistance to any complainant who wishes to press criminal charges under the Indian Penal Code. Failure to constitute an IC attracts a fine of up to fifty thousand rupees for a first offence, with progressive penalties and potential licence cancellation for repeat violations.

## **IV. Implementation Challenges**

### **4.1 Awareness Deficit**

Despite more than a decade since the Act's enactment, awareness remains uneven. National Commission for Women data indicate that a substantial share of women in the unorganised sector are unaware that the Act extends protection to them.<sup>13</sup>

Even in the corporate sector, awareness programmes are often reduced to annual online modules that fulfil a compliance checkbox rather than fostering genuine understanding. Research published in the MSW Management Journal notes that employees frequently conflate IC proceedings with formal judicial proceedings, creating unrealistic expectations and discouraging complaints.<sup>14</sup>

#### **4.2 Dysfunctional Internal Committees**

A recurrent finding across empirical studies is that ICs frequently fail to function with the independence and competence the statute envisages. The external expert member is often selected for administrative convenience rather than subject-matter expertise. Committee members receive inadequate training in principles of natural justice, evidence assessment, and sensitivity to survivor trauma. Inquiries are sometimes concluded within days in a perfunctory manner, or stretched over months in a manner that compounds the complainant's distress.<sup>15</sup>

#### **4.3 Fear of Retaliation and Underreporting**

The structural power asymmetry that characterises most harassment incidents — perpetrators are typically in supervisory positions — makes retaliation a credible threat. Victims routinely report fear of professional marginalisation, poor performance assessments, and ostracism by colleagues. Social and cultural factors amplify this deterrent: in hierarchical workplace cultures, reporting a superior is perceived as a breach of loyalty rather than the exercise of a legal right.<sup>16</sup>

#### **4.4 Formal–Informal Sector Disparity**

The gulf between formal and informal sectors in terms of POSH compliance is stark. Multinational corporations and large domestic firms typically have dedicated compliance infrastructure, regular audits, and zero-tolerance policies. By contrast, the informal economy — which employs the majority of India's female workforce — operates almost entirely outside the Act's practical reach. The LCC mechanism, while conceptually sound, lacks the outreach infrastructure, staffing, and awareness to bridge this gap.<sup>17</sup>

#### **4.5 Digital and Remote Work Environments**

The proliferation of remote work and digital communication platforms has introduced new modalities of harassment — unsolicited messages, inappropriate content shared over work

applications, and online surveillance — that the 2013 Act does not expressly address. Courts have begun extending the Act's definition to virtual workplaces, but legislative clarification is overdue.<sup>18</sup>

## **V. International Framework and India's Obligations**

India's domestic framework is embedded within a global normative architecture that creates both obligations and benchmarks.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognises every person's right to work in conditions of dignity and non-discrimination.<sup>19</sup>

CEDAW, ratified by India in 1993, obligates state parties to adopt legislative and policy measures to eliminate workplace discrimination in all its forms, expressly including sexual harassment.<sup>20</sup>

The ILO's landmark Convention No. 190 (2019) is the first binding international instrument specifically addressing violence and harassment in the world of work.<sup>21</sup> It extends protection beyond the workplace to work-related settings such as travel, employer-provided accommodation, and digital communications. Supplemented by Recommendation No. 206,<sup>22</sup> Convention 190 calls for inclusive protection that covers the gig economy and supply chains — a standard that India's current framework does not fully meet, since India has not yet ratified Convention 190.

## **VI. Comparative Perspectives**

### **6.1 United States**

The United States addressed workplace sexual harassment through Title VII of the Civil Rights Act 1964 and subsequent judicial interpretation.<sup>23</sup> The Supreme Court decisions in *Meritor Savings Bank v. Vinson* (1986) and *Burlington Industries v. Ellerth* (1998) established the doctrine of employer vicarious liability and the affirmative defence available where employers maintain effective anti-harassment policies. The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) provides a powerful independent enforcement mechanism with investigation and litigation powers that are largely absent from the Indian model.

## **6.2 United Kingdom**

The Equality Act 2010 consolidates anti-discrimination law in Great Britain.<sup>24</sup> It defines harassment broadly to encompass conduct related to any protected characteristic (including sex) that creates an intimidating, hostile, degrading, or offensive environment. The Equality and Human Rights Commission has power to conduct formal investigations, issue compliance notices, and apply for court orders. Importantly, the 2023 Worker Protection (Amendment of Equality Act 2010) Act introduced a proactive duty on employers to take reasonable steps to prevent sexual harassment — a shift from reactive complaint-handling to preventive obligation that India would benefit from emulating.

## **6.3 Australia**

Australia's Sex Discrimination Act 1984 and subsequent amendments place anti-harassment obligations on employers and extend liability to agents and contractors. The Australian Human Rights Commission conducts conciliation between parties and publishes compliance data. Notably, Australia's model explicitly addresses online and remote-work harassment, filling a gap that India's framework has yet to address.

## **6.4 Lessons for India**

Three comparative lessons are particularly salient. First, independent enforcement agencies with investigation powers — modelled on the EEOC or EHRC — would address the endemic problem of non-compliant employers facing no meaningful accountability. Second, a positive duty framework, requiring employers to demonstrate active prevention rather than merely respond to complaints, would shift organisational culture from compliance to genuine change. Third, explicit legislative coverage of digital and remote work environments is essential in light of evolving work patterns.<sup>25</sup>

# **VII. Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations**

## **7.1 Summary of Key Findings**

This article's analysis yields several overarching findings. The POSH Act is substantively well- designed: its definition of harassment is broad, its institutional mechanisms are appropriately structured, and its penal provisions provide a credible deterrent on paper.<sup>26</sup> However, a persistent and significant gap exists between legislative text and lived reality.

IC proceedings are frequently inadequate or tokenistic. Awareness in the informal sector is negligible. The LCC mechanism is vastly under-resourced. And the Act's silence on digital harassment is an increasingly serious lacuna.

The judiciary has been an important corrective force, but judicial review is neither sufficiently swift nor sufficiently accessible to serve as the primary enforcement mechanism for a working-class woman in an unregistered enterprise.<sup>19</sup>

India's constitutional commitment to equality and dignity,<sup>29</sup> read alongside its CEDAW obligations,<sup>30</sup> demands a more ambitious and adequately resourced implementation framework.

## 7.2 Recommendations

Drawing on the foregoing analysis, this article proposes the following reforms:

1. Establish an Independent Regulatory Authority. A dedicated national body — analogous to the EEOC — with powers to conduct audits, investigate complaints, impose penalties, and publish compliance rankings would inject genuine enforcement muscle into the existing framework.
2. Introduce a Positive Duty on Employers. Following the United Kingdom's 2023 amendment, the POSH Act should be amended to require employers to take 'reasonable steps' to prevent harassment proactively, shifting the legal standard from reactive redressal to preventive obligation.<sup>31</sup>
3. Mandate Structured IC Training. Accreditation requirements for IC members — including modules on natural justice, trauma-informed interviewing, and evidence evaluation — should be prescribed by the Ministry of Women and Child Development.
4. Expand LCC Infrastructure. Each district LCC should be allocated dedicated personnel, an operational budget, and a public outreach mandate. Mobile LCC units and partnerships with local NGOs could dramatically improve access in rural and peri-urban areas.<sup>32</sup>
5. Legislate on Digital Harassment. An amendment expressly extending the Act's reach to digital communications, online work platforms, and remote work environments — consistent with ILO Convention 190 — is both legally sound and practically urgent.<sup>33</sup>
6. Ratify ILO Convention 190. Ratification would signal India's commitment to international best practice and import the Convention's comprehensive definition

of the ‘world of work’ into domestic discourse.

7. Gender-Neutral Expansion. Consideration should be given to extending the Act’s protection to all employees regardless of gender identity, ensuring that the statute’s dignitary foundations are universally applied.<sup>34</sup>

### **7.3 Conclusion**

The POSH Act represents a genuinely progressive legislative achievement. It translates the Supreme Court’s constitutional vision into a structured institutional framework that, where properly implemented, demonstrably improves workplace safety and culture. Yet the distance between the statute’s promise and its practical delivery remains troublingly wide. Bridging that distance requires not merely stricter enforcement but a whole-of-society commitment to the cultural transformation that the law alone cannot accomplish.

As feminist legal scholars have long observed, law is both a mirror and a chisel: it reflects existing social norms and, where wielded with conviction, reshapes them.<sup>35</sup>

The POSH Act has the potential to be a powerful chisel. Whether it is used as such depends on the political will of the state, the institutional capacity of employers, and the informed agency of the workers it was designed to protect.

### **Bibliography**

#### **Legislation and International Instruments**

Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (Act 14 of 2013).

Constitution of India, Arts 14, 15, 19(1)(g), 21.

Indian Penal Code 1860, ss 354, 354A, 354D, 509.

Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), UNGA Res 34/180 (1979).

ILO Convention No 190 on Violence and Harassment (2019) and Recommendation No 206. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, UNGA Res 217A(III) (1948).

Equality Act 2010 (UK); Civil Rights Act 1964 (US), Title VII.

#### **Cases**

Vishaka & Ors v State of Rajasthan & Ors (1997) 6 SCC 241. Apparel Export Promotion Council v A K Chopra (1999) 1 SCC 759. Medha Kotwal Lele v Union of India (2013) 1 SCC 297.

### **Books and Articles**

Agnes F, Law and Gender Inequality in India (Oxford University Press, 1999).

Agrawal A, 'Critical Perspectives on the Limitations of the POSH Act, 2013' (2024) International Journal of Social Science and Economic Research.

Mondal J, 'Sexual Harassment at Workplace: Analysing the Implementation of POSH Act' (2025) WISDOM Journal.

Nanda R, 'Efficacy of the POSH Act in India: Challenges of Implementation and Compliance' (2024) MSW Management Journal.

'The POSH Act in India: Progress, Shortcomings, and the Path Forward' (2024) International Journal of Advances in Social Sciences.

### **Government and Official Sources**

Ministry of Women and Child Development, 'Annual Report 2023–24' (Government of India, 2024). National Commission for Women, 'Annual Report on Workplace Harassment Statistics' (2022–23).

SHe-Box Online Complaint Management System, Ministry of Women and Child Development

<<https://shebox.nic.in>>.

Human Rights Watch, 'Harassment and Discrimination of Women Workers in India' (2014).