

INDIA'S PREVENTION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT LAW: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF STRENGTHS, WEAKNESSES, AND THE PATH FORWARD

Shashi Juneja¹

¹Amity University Chhattisgarh, Raipur

shashijuneja.adv@gmail.com¹

1. Introduction

Sexual harassment in the workplace represents one of the most pervasive violations of human dignity and equality¹. In India, where women's participation in the formal workforce has historically been limited, creating safe working environments is not merely a matter of legal compliance but a fundamental prerequisite for economic empowerment and social progress. The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013², commonly known as the POSH Act, emerged as India's legislative response to this critical challenge, marking a watershed moment in the country's commitment to workplace dignity and gender equality.³

The journey toward comprehensive legislation protecting women from workplace harassment was neither quick nor straightforward. It required the intervention of India's highest court, sustained advocacy by civil society and ultimately parliamentary action to translate judicial guidelines into enforceable law. More than a decade since its enactment, the POSH Act stands as both a testament to progressive legislative intent and a subject of ongoing debate regarding its implementation, scope and effectiveness. This article examines the Act through multiple lenses: its historical context and development, its structural framework and key provisions, its demonstrable strengths, its notable weaknesses and gaps and most critically, the reforms necessary to transform it from a well-intentioned statute into a truly effective instrument of workplace justice.

2. Historical Context and Legislative Genesis

The legal recognition of workplace sexual harassment in India is rooted in judicial intervention rather than legislative foresight. Prior to the late 1990s, Indian labour law and criminal law lacked a coherent framework to address sexual harassment in institutional workplaces. Women subjected to harassment were forced to rely on general criminal provisions, which were ill-suited to address the systemic and power-based nature of workplace misconduct.

2.1 Before POSH: IPC and Limited Remedies

Prior to the enactment of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013, Indian women relied almost exclusively on the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC)⁴ for addressing incidents of sexual misconduct. The IPC contained certain gender-specific provisions, most notably:

¹ INDIA CONST. art. 21 (Right to life and dignity).

² The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, No. 14 of 2013, INDIA CODE (2013).

³ Ministry of Women & Child Development, Handbook on Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace 1–3 (2015).

⁴ Indian Penal Code, No. 45 of 1860, INDIA CODE (1860).

- **Section 354** (assault or criminal force to outrage the modesty of a woman),
- **Section 509**⁵(word, gesture, or act intended to insult the modesty of a woman), and
- **Section 354A**⁶, introduced later through the Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, 2013⁷, which explicitly criminalized sexual harassment.

In the **Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS)**, which replaced the Indian Penal Code (IPC) on July 1, 2024, the sections related to outraging the modesty and sexual harassment of women have been renumbered and consolidated under **Chapter V** (Offences Against Woman and Child).

Here are the new section numbers for 354 IPC, 354A IPC, and 509 IPC:

- **Section 354 IPC → Section 74 BNS**
- **Section 354A IPC → Section 75 BNS**
- **Section 509 IPC → Section 79 BNS**

While these provisions recognized certain forms of sexually inappropriate behavior, they suffered from serious conceptual and practical limitations when applied to workplace contexts. First, the IPC framework was inherently punitive and individual-centric, focusing on criminal prosecution rather than prevention, deterrence, or institutional accountability. Second, these sections failed to acknowledge the continuum of sexual harassment, particularly non-physical conduct such as unwelcome advances, verbal remarks, intimidation, or hostile work environments. Third, criminal proceedings under the IPC were adversarial, time-consuming, and stigmatizing, often deterring women from reporting harassment—especially when the perpetrator occupied a superior position.

Most critically, the IPC did not recognize the employer's responsibility in preventing or addressing sexual harassment. There were no procedural safeguards, internal grievance mechanisms, or victim-centric inquiry processes. The law thus treated workplace harassment as a private criminal wrong rather than a violation arising from institutional failure and power imbalance. As a result, women were left without accessible, timely, or effective remedies, reinforcing a culture of silence and impunity within workplaces.

2.2 *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997)

The jurisprudential turning point in India's approach to workplace sexual harassment came with the landmark decision in *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997).⁸ The case arose from the brutal gang rape of Bhanwari Devi, a social worker employed under a government program, who was assaulted while attempting to prevent a child marriage in rural Rajasthan. The failure of both the criminal justice system and administrative machinery to provide redress prompted a group of women's rights organizations to approach the Supreme Court under Article 32 of the Constitution.

In a path-breaking judgment, the Supreme Court acknowledged for the first time that sexual harassment at the workplace constitutes a violation of women's fundamental rights under Articles 14 (equality), 15 (non-discrimination), 19(1)(g) (right to practice any profession), and 21 (right to life and dignity)⁹. Significantly, the Court drew upon international human rights instruments—particularly the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of

⁵ Indian Penal Code, No. 45 of 1860, § 509, INDIA CODE (1860).

⁶ Indian Penal Code, No. 45 of 1860, § 354, INDIA CODE (1860).

⁷ Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, No. 13 of 2013, § 7, INDIA CODE (2013) (introducing Indian Penal Code § 354A).

⁸ *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*, (1997) 6 S.C.C. 241, 244 (India).

⁹ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 19(1)(g), 21.

Discrimination against Women (CEDAW)—to interpret constitutional guarantees in the absence of domestic legislation.¹⁰

The Court framed and issued the Vishaka Guidelines, which were declared binding and enforceable law under Article 141¹¹ until Parliament enacted appropriate legislation. These guidelines imposed affirmative obligations upon employers to prevent sexual harassment, ensure safe working environments, and establish complaint mechanisms.

The transformative nature of the Vishaka Guidelines can be understood on three interrelated levels. First, they constitutionalized workplace sexual harassment, reframing it as a human rights violation rather than a mere disciplinary or criminal issue. Second, they introduced the principle of employer liability, mandating institutional responsibility irrespective of whether the workplace was public or private. Third, they laid the conceptual foundation for institutional grievance redressal by requiring the constitution of complaints committees with female representation and external members—an idea that would later crystallize into the Internal Committee (IC) under the POSH Act.

2.3 Legislative Milestone: The POSH Act, 2013

The Act was passed in response to rising activism and public outrage post the 2012 Delhi gang rape, embodying both civil rights protection and workplace obligations.¹²

The enactment of the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 marks a critical legislative milestone in India's gender justice jurisprudence. While the judicial foundation for workplace protection had been laid through the Vishaka Guidelines, it was sustained public pressure, intensified feminist advocacy, and heightened political accountability following the 2012 Delhi gang rape that finally catalysed legislative action. The incident triggered unprecedented national outrage, compelling the State to confront systemic failures in protecting women's bodily integrity, dignity, and safety—not only in public spaces but also within institutional environments.

The POSH Act must therefore be understood as part of a broader post-2012 reformist wave, which sought to re-evaluate India's legal architecture governing sexual violence, gender equality, and workplace safety.¹³ Unlike criminal law amendments that focused on punitive responses, the POSH Act adopted a rights-based and preventive framework, explicitly recognising sexual harassment at the workplace as a form of gender discrimination and a violation of women's fundamental rights. This legislative approach reflects a conscious shift from reactive criminalisation to proactive institutional governance.

Significantly, the Act transformed judicial guidelines into a comprehensive statutory regime. It codified key concepts introduced by the Supreme Court, including the definition of sexual harassment, the notion of a hostile work environment, and the principle of employer responsibility. By imposing mandatory obligations on employers to prevent harassment, constitute redressal bodies, and ensure procedural fairness, the Act embedded workplace safety within the realm of labour regulation and organizational accountability. In doing so, it moved beyond individual fault to address structural and institutional complicity.

The POSH Act also reflects India's international commitments under global human rights instruments, particularly the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW). The legislation operationalises the State's obligation to provide

¹⁰ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women arts. 11, 24, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13.

¹¹ INDIA CONST. art. 141.

¹² Justice J.S. Verma, Justice Leila Seth & Gopal Subramaniam, Report of the Committee on Amendments to Criminal Law 1–3 (2013).

¹³ Ministry of Women & Child Development, Handbook on Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace 1–5 (2015).

effective remedies against gender-based discrimination in employment and public life. Its emphasis on dignity, equality, and access to justice aligns the domestic legal framework with international labour and human rights standards.

3. Structural Framework and Key Provisions

Scope and Definitions

The POSH Act adopts an expansive and purposive approach in defining both sexual harassment and workplace. Sexual harassment is defined through an illustrative list of unwelcome acts or behaviour of a sexual nature, encompassing physical, verbal, non-verbal, and environmental conduct. This flexible definition enables adjudicatory bodies to address evolving forms of harassment, including subtle and contextual misconduct.¹⁴

3.1 Core Structure

The Act includes:

Definition of Sexual Harassment [Section 2(n)]

Section 2(n) of the Act provides a broad and purposive definition of sexual harassment by enumerating an illustrative list of “unwelcome acts or behavior” of a sexual nature. These include physical contact and advances, demands or requests for sexual favors, sexually colored remarks, showing pornography, and any other unwelcome physical, verbal, or non-verbal conduct. The non-exhaustive nature of this definition reflects legislative recognition that sexual harassment manifests in diverse and evolving forms that cannot be captured through rigid categorization.

The emphasis on “unwelcome” conduct is particularly significant, as it centers the subjective experience of the aggrieved woman rather than the intent or perception of the respondent.¹⁵ This approach enables adjudicatory bodies to address subtle, indirect, and contextual forms of harassment, including conduct that creates an intimidating, hostile, or humiliating work environment. By incorporating environmental and psychological harm within its ambit, the Act moves beyond a narrow focus on physical misconduct and aligns with contemporary understandings of gender-based discrimination.¹⁶

Establishment of Internal Committees (IC) [Section 4]

Section 4 mandates the constitution of an Internal Committee in every workplace employing ten or more employees.¹⁷ The IC is envisaged as the primary institutional mechanism for addressing complaints of sexual harassment within the organization. Its composition—requiring a senior woman employee as Presiding Officer, at least two employee members committed to women’s causes, and an external member with legal or social expertise—is designed to ensure independence, sensitivity, and procedural fairness.

The IC performs a quasi-judicial function, conducting inquiries in accordance with principles of natural justice while maintaining confidentiality and safeguarding the dignity of the parties involved. Its internal positioning enables prompt and accessible redressal, reducing the need for immediate recourse to formal judicial processes. At the same time, the inclusion of an external member seeks to counterbalance internal hierarchies and mitigate institutional bias, a concern repeatedly highlighted in judicial and empirical assessments.

Local Committees (LC) for Unorganised Sectors [Section 6]

Recognising that a significant proportion of women in India work outside formal employment structures, Section 6 provides for the establishment of Local Complaints Committees at the district and block levels. The LCC mechanism extends the protective

¹⁴ Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India, (2013) 1 S.C.C. 297, 310–12 (India).

¹⁵ Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, (1999) 1 S.C.C. 759, 770–71 (India).

¹⁶ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 21.

¹⁷ Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, No. 14 of 2013, § 4(1), INDIA CODE (2013).

umbrella of the Act to women employed in unorganised sectors, including domestic workers, daily wage laborers, interns, trainees, and workers in small establishments with fewer than ten employees.

The decentralized nature of LCs reflects a commitment to inclusive access to justice and acknowledges the heightened vulnerability of women working without formal employer-employee relationships.¹⁸ By placing responsibility on local administrative authorities, the Act seeks to ensure that protection against sexual harassment is not contingent upon organisational size or formality. However, the effectiveness of LCs remains uneven, often constrained by inadequate resources, lack of awareness, and administrative inertia.

Procedural Safeguards and Penalties [Sections 9–13]

Sections 9 to 13 lay down the procedural framework governing the filing, inquiry, and resolution of complaints. These provisions prescribe time limits for filing complaints, outline the inquiry process, provide for interim reliefs such as transfer or leave, and empower committees to recommend disciplinary action or compensation. The procedural design attempts to balance competing imperatives—fair hearing for the respondent, confidentiality of proceedings, and protection of the complainant from retaliation or secondary victimisation.

The Act's emphasis on confidentiality under Section 16 and its provision for penalties in cases of breach underscore the sensitive nature of sexual harassment complaints. At the same time, the statute permits consequences for malicious complaints, though judicial interpretation has cautioned against misuse of this provision to silence genuine grievances.¹⁹ The procedural safeguards thus reflect an effort to create a humane, accessible, and credible redressal process within institutional settings.

Employer Obligations and Penalties for Non-Compliance [Section 19]

Section 19 constitutes the enforcement backbone of the POSH Act by imposing affirmative obligations upon employers. These include the duty to provide a safe working environment, organise awareness and training programmes, assist the complainant in pursuing criminal remedies where necessary, and implement the recommendations of the complaints committee. Employers are also required to display penal consequences of sexual harassment prominently and submit annual compliance reports.

Failure to comply with these obligations attracts monetary penalties, and repeated non-compliance may result in cancellation of business licenses or withdrawal of governmental benefits. This shift from individual culpability to institutional responsibility marks a significant evolution in Indian workplace regulation. By holding employers accountable for preventive and corrective measures, the Act embeds gender justice within organisational governance and compliance regimes.

4. Institutional Mechanisms

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 establishes a dual institutional framework for addressing complaints of workplace sexual harassment. This framework is premised on the recognition that a one-size-fits-all mechanism would be inadequate in a labour market characterised by vast formal–informal divides, hierarchical power relations, and sectoral diversity.²⁰ Accordingly, the Act creates two parallel redressal bodies: Internal Committees (ICs) within formal workplaces and Local Committees (LCs) at the district level for the unorganised sector and exceptional situations.

¹⁸ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women art. 11, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13.

¹⁹ *Union of India v. Reema Srinivasan Iyengar*, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 290, 302–03 (India).

²⁰ Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women art. 11, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13.

This decentralised institutional design reflects an attempt to balance accessibility, efficiency, and inclusivity while embedding redressal mechanisms within both organisational and administrative structures. At a normative level, these mechanisms seek to operationalise the constitutional guarantees of equality, dignity, and access to justice by providing women with proximate, non-adversarial forums for grievance redressal.²¹

4.1 Internal Committees (ICs)

Internal Committees constitute the primary institutional mechanism under the Act and are mandatory in every workplace employing ten or more persons. The IC is envisioned not merely as a grievance cell but as a quasi-judicial body entrusted with adjudicatory, recommendatory, and preventive functions. Its internal placement within the organisation is intended to facilitate timely reporting, contextual understanding of workplace dynamics, and swift remedial action.

The composition of the IC is statutorily structured to promote gender sensitivity, impartiality, and credibility. It must be headed by a woman Presiding Officer at a senior level, include at least two employee members committed to women's causes or with experience in social work, and crucially, one external member drawn from a non-governmental organisation or association engaged with women's rights or possessing legal expertise.²² This mandatory inclusion of an external member reflects legislative awareness of entrenched power asymmetries within workplaces and the risk of institutional bias influencing internal inquiries. By incorporating an external perspective, the Act seeks to mitigate hierarchical pressures, conflicts of interest, and organisational defensiveness that may otherwise compromise the fairness of proceedings.²³ The ICC's design thus embodies a hybrid institutional model—internal for accessibility, yet partially external for independence.

4.2 Local Committees (LCs)

Local Committees, constituted at the district level, serve as the institutional safety net for women excluded from formal organisational structures. These include women working in establishments with fewer than ten employees, domestic workers, daily wage labourers, interns, trainees, and others in the unorganised sector. Additionally, LCs are empowered to inquire into complaints where the employer is the respondent, thereby addressing situations where internal mechanisms would be inherently compromised.

The LC framework reflects a legislative commitment to substantive equality by recognising that vulnerability to sexual harassment is often heightened in informal employment settings marked by economic dependency, lack of documentation, and absence of internal governance structures.²⁴ By placing responsibility on the district administration, the Act attempts to ensure that access to redressal does not depend on organisational capacity or employment status.

However, despite their conceptual significance, LCs remain the weakest link in the institutional architecture of the Act.²⁵ Empirical studies and governmental reports consistently point to poor constitution, lack of visibility, inadequate training, and minimal utilisation of LCs, raising serious concerns about the inclusiveness of the POSH framework in practice.

4.3 Judicial Scrutiny and Structural Deficiencies

²¹ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 21.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, (1997) 6 S.C.C. 241, 248–49 (India).

²² Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, No. 14 of 2013, § 4(2)(a)–(c), INDIA CODE (2013).

²³ *Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India*, (2013) 1 S.C.C. 297, 314–15 (India).

²⁴ INDIA CONST. art. 14.

²⁵ Ministry of Women & Child Development, Review of Implementation of the POSH Act (2018).

Judicial oversight has repeatedly highlighted that the effectiveness of institutional mechanisms under the POSH Act depends not on their formal existence but on their functional integrity. Courts have expressed concern over the widespread tendency of organisations to constitute ICs in a perfunctory or symbolic manner, often treating compliance as a bureaucratic obligation rather than a substantive duty.

In *Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court underscored that complaints committees must operate as meaningful redressal bodies and not merely exist on paper. The Court observed that failure to constitute properly functioning committees amounts to a continuing violation of women's fundamental rights.²⁶ This judicial warning remains particularly relevant in the post-POSH era, as many of the same deficiencies persist under the statutory regime.

One recurring concern identified in judicial decisions and inquiry reports is the appointment of external members who lack independence, relevant expertise, or genuine engagement with women's rights. In some instances, external members are selected from individuals closely associated with management, thereby defeating the very purpose of external oversight. Similarly, IC members are often appointed without adequate training, resulting in flawed inquiries, procedural irregularities, and legally unsustainable recommendations.

4.4 Institutional Credibility and the Problem of Formalism

The gap between the normative design of institutional mechanisms and their practical functioning raises broader questions about institutional credibility. When committees are inadequately constituted, under-trained, or subject to managerial influence, they risk becoming instruments of organisational control rather than forums for justice. Such formalistic compliance undermines employee confidence, discourages reporting, and perpetuates cultures of silence.

This credibility deficit is particularly pronounced in educational institutions, hospitals, and government departments, where rigid hierarchies and reputational concerns often shape institutional responses to complaints. The failure of ICs and LCs to function independently thus not only weakens the enforcement of the POSH Act but also erodes the transformative potential of workplace equality jurisprudence.

4.5 Analytical Significance

The institutional mechanisms under the POSH Act represent one of the most ambitious attempts in Indian law to decentralise access to justice and embed rights enforcement within everyday governance structures. Their success, however, depends on meaningful constitution, independence, training, and oversight.²⁷ As subsequent sections of this research argue, strengthening these institutional mechanisms—particularly through capacity building, monitoring, and accountability—is central to assessing the real effectiveness of the POSH Act in practice.

5. Procedural Framework

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 prescribes a detailed procedural framework for the handling of sexual harassment complaints, reflecting a conscious legislative effort to balance victim protection with procedural fairness. The procedural architecture of the Act is designed to function as a civil, in-house redressal mechanism distinct from the criminal justice system, while nevertheless incorporating foundational principles of natural justice, due process, and reasoned decision-making.

²⁶ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 21.

²⁷ *Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India*, (2013) 1 S.C.C. 297, 314–16 (India).

At a structural level, the Act regulates every stage of the complaint lifecycle—from filing and inquiry to recommendations and enforcement—through statutorily defined timelines and safeguards. This codified procedure aims to ensure accessibility, confidentiality, and expeditious resolution, thereby reducing the psychological, professional, and social costs often associated with formal litigation.²⁸

5.1 Filing of Complaints and Timelines

The procedural framework commences with the filing of a written complaint by the aggrieved woman within a prescribed period, ordinarily three months from the date of the incident or the last occurrence in cases of continuing harassment. Recognising the trauma and power imbalance inherent in such cases, the Act permits extension of this limitation period where sufficient cause is shown. This flexibility reflects legislative sensitivity to the realities of delayed reporting arising from fear of retaliation, stigma, or institutional pressure.

The Act further allows legal heirs or designated persons to file complaints in cases where the aggrieved woman is unable to do so due to physical or mental incapacity. This inclusive approach reinforces the remedial orientation of the statute and aligns it with constitutional guarantees of access to justice.

5.2 Inquiry Procedure and Principles of Natural Justice

Once a complaint is admitted, the Internal Committee or Local Committee is required to conduct an inquiry in accordance with principles of natural justice. The respondent must be given notice and an opportunity to be heard, while the complainant is entitled to a fair, respectful, and non-intimidating process. The inquiry is required to be completed within a statutorily prescribed period, reinforcing the Act's commitment to time-bound justice.

Importantly, the Act does not mandate adherence to rigid evidentiary standards applicable to criminal trials. Instead, committees are expected to adopt a fact-finding approach guided by probabilities, credibility of testimony, and contextual assessment of workplace power relations.²⁹ Judicial interpretation has consistently affirmed that sexual harassment inquiries are not criminal prosecutions but specialised adjudicatory processes aimed at determining responsibility within institutional settings.³⁰

This approach finds jurisprudential support in *Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra*, where the Supreme Court underscored that the absence of physical contact does not negate sexual harassment and that disciplinary authorities must assess conduct through the lens of dignity and workplace propriety rather than technical criminal thresholds.

5.3 Interim Reliefs and Protective Measures

A critical component of the procedural framework is the provision for interim relief during the pendency of inquiry. Upon request by the aggrieved woman, the committee may recommend measures such as transfer of either party, grant of leave to the complainant, or any other relief deemed appropriate. These provisions are intended to prevent further harassment, safeguard the complainant from retaliation, and preserve the integrity of the inquiry process.

Interim measures reflect a victim-centric philosophy, acknowledging that procedural delays can themselves operate as a form of injustice.³¹ However, their effectiveness depends heavily on employer cooperation and timely implementation—an area where enforcement gaps frequently arise.

5.4 Suggestions, Penalties, and Enforcement

²⁸ *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan*, (1997) 6 S.C.C. 241, 248–49 (India).

²⁹ *Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra*, (1999) 1 S.C.C. 759, 770–71 (India).

³⁰ *Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India*, (2013) 1 S.C.C. 297, 312–14 (India).

³¹ INDIA CONST. art. 21.

Upon completion of the inquiry, the committee is required to issue reasoned findings and recommend appropriate action. Where allegations are proved, recommendations may include disciplinary action in accordance with service rules, deduction of wages as compensation, or other remedial measures. In cases where the complaint is not substantiated, the Act mandates that no adverse action be taken against the complainant merely for lack of proof.

The Act also provides for penalties in cases of malicious complaints, though judicial authorities have repeatedly cautioned that this provision must be applied sparingly and only where malice is clearly established.³² Overzealous invocation of this clause risks deterring genuine complaints and undermining the protective purpose of the legislation.

6. Strengths of the POSH Act

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 represents one of the most progressive legislative interventions in Indian labour and equality jurisprudence. Its strengths lie not merely in the recognition of sexual harassment as a legal wrong, but in the manner in which it reconceptualises workplace safety as a question of dignity, equality, and institutional responsibility. Unlike earlier criminal law approaches, the POSH Act adopts a rights-based, preventive, and structural framework, making it a transformative statute rather than a purely remedial one.

6.1 Comprehensive Scope and Definitions

One of the foremost strengths of the POSH Act is its comprehensive and purposive definition of sexual harassment. Unlike the Indian Penal Code or the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), which focus primarily on overt, individualised acts of sexual misconduct, the POSH Act recognises harassment as a continuum of behaviours that may be physical, verbal, non-verbal, emotional, or environmental in nature.³³

The Act expressly includes:

- verbal and emotional abuse,
- implicit or explicit threats affecting employment conditions,
- creation of a hostile or intimidating work environment, and
- implied quid pro quo arrangements, even in the absence of physical contact.

This broader conceptualisation acknowledges that sexual harassment often operates through subtle coercion, power imbalance, and institutional silence rather than through explicit criminal acts. By focusing on the impact of conduct on the dignity and working conditions of the aggrieved woman, the Act moves beyond the intent-centric logic of criminal law³⁴. As Sharma and Shreshth (2024) observe, this approach allows adjudicatory bodies to capture “contextual and relational misconduct that would otherwise remain legally invisible.”³⁵

Such definitional breadth is particularly significant in academic institutions, government offices, and hierarchical workplaces, where authority and dependency can render consent illusory and resistance professionally costly.

6.2 Institutional Innovation through ICC and LCC Mechanisms

A major institutional strength of the POSH Act lies in its creation of specialised redressal bodies—the Internal Committee (IC) and the Local Committee (LC). This dual mechanism decentralises grievance redressal and embeds accountability within both organisational and administrative structures.

³² Union of India v. Reema Srinivasan Iyengar, (2019) 4 S.C.C. 290, 302–03 (India).

³³ Indian Penal Code, No. 45 of 1860, §§ 354, 354A, 509, INDIA CODE (1860).
Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, §§ 74, 75 (India).

³⁴ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 21.

³⁵ Shivani Sharma & R. Shreshth, Re-Conceptualising Workplace Sexual Harassment in India, 59 *Indian J. Gender Stud.* 112, 118–19 (2024).

The IC model represents a departure from traditional disciplinary frameworks by establishing a quasi-judicial body within the workplace itself. This enables timely, accessible, and context-sensitive resolution of complaints, reducing dependence on formal litigation. Simultaneously, the inclusion of an external member introduces an element of independence and oversight, mitigating internal power asymmetries.

The LC mechanism further strengthens the Act by extending protection to women in the unorganised sector and in situations where the employer is the respondent. This inclusive design reflects legislative awareness of India's informal labour realities and reinforces the principle that protection against sexual harassment is not contingent upon the formality of employment.

Together, these mechanisms shift the focus from individual culpability alone to systemic and institutional responsibility, marking a significant evolution in Indian workplace governance.

6.3 Employer Accountability and Preventive Orientation

Another defining strength of the POSH Act is its emphasis on employer accountability. Section 19 of the Act imposes mandatory obligations on employers not only to respond to complaints but to actively prevent sexual harassment through awareness programmes, training, policy dissemination, and institutional support.

This preventive orientation distinguishes the POSH framework from criminal law, which typically intervenes only after harm has occurred.³⁶ By requiring organisations to create safe working environments and by penalising non-compliance, the Act embeds gender justice within corporate and institutional compliance cultures.

The imposition of penalties for failure to constitute committees or implement recommendations signals a shift from symbolic compliance to enforceable responsibility. In normative terms, this approach recognises that workplace harassment is often facilitated by organisational inaction, silence, or tolerance, and that meaningful reform must therefore address institutional behaviour rather than isolated misconduct.

6.4 Judicial Recognition and Constitutional Legitimacy

Judicial interpretation has played a crucial role in reinforcing the authority and constitutional legitimacy of the POSH Act. Courts have consistently treated the statute as an extension of the Supreme Court's equality and dignity jurisprudence rather than as a mere service regulation.

In *Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court directed Central and State Governments to monitor the effective implementation of sexual harassment guidelines and mechanisms, holding that failure to do so constitutes a continuing violation of fundamental rights. This decision underscored that the right to a safe workplace is inseparable from Articles 14, 15, and 21 of the Constitution.³⁷

Similarly, in *Dr. Punita K. Sodhi v. Union of India*, the Delhi High Court emphasised the need for procedural fairness, independence, and impartiality of complaints committees.³⁸ The Court reinforced that such bodies must function as genuine adjudicatory forums and not as extensions of management control.

These judicial pronouncements strengthen the POSH Act by insulating it from dilution through administrative convenience and by affirming its status as a rights-enforcing statute grounded in constitutional values.

6.5 International Alignment and Global Human Rights Standards

³⁶ Criminal Law (Amendment) Act, No. 13 of 2013, INDIA CODE (2013).

³⁷ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 21.

³⁸ *Dr. Punita K. Sodhi v. Union of India*, 2010 SCC OnLine Del 4248, ¶¶ 54–57 (India).

The POSH Act is also notable for its alignment with international human rights and labour standards. Its legislative philosophy draws directly from the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), which obligates States to eliminate discrimination against women in employment and public life.

More recently, the Act's objectives resonate strongly with the principles articulated in ILO Convention No. 190³⁹, which recognises the right of everyone to a world of work free from violence and harassment, including gender-based harassment. Although India has not yet ratified Convention No. 190, the POSH Act substantially mirrors its core commitments, particularly in recognising psychological harm, hostile environments, and employer responsibility.

By incorporating international norms into domestic law, the POSH Act enhances India's global human rights credentials and demonstrates normative leadership among developing economies in addressing workplace gender justice.

7. Critical Weaknesses and Gaps in the POSH Act

Despite its progressive intent and structural innovations, the Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 suffers from several substantive and procedural limitations that undermine its effectiveness. These weaknesses are not merely issues of implementation but reflect deeper conceptual, constitutional, and institutional gaps in the legislative framework.⁴⁰ A critical examination of these shortcomings is essential to assess whether the Act fulfils its transformative promise of workplace equality and dignity.⁴¹

7.1 Gender-Exclusive Framework

One of the most fundamental criticisms of the POSH Act is its gender-exclusive design. The Act restricts the right to file complaints solely to "aggrieved women," thereby excluding male and transgender persons from its protective ambit. This exclusion is increasingly untenable in light of evolving constitutional jurisprudence on gender equality and non-discrimination.⁴²

7.2 Inadequate Time Limit for Filing Complaints

The POSH Act prescribes a limitation period of three months for filing complaints, extendable at the discretion of the committee upon showing sufficient cause. While this provision appears flexible on paper, its application in practice often results in rigid enforcement, ignoring the psychological trauma, fear of retaliation, and professional dependency that delay reporting.

Courts have repeatedly acknowledged that sexual harassment is not an ordinary service dispute but a dignity-based injury. In *Madhavi Vishwanathan v. Hindustan Petroleum*, the Bombay High Court adopted a liberal approach to limitation, recognising that delay in reporting is frequently a consequence of coercive workplace dynamics rather than lack of credibility.⁴³

However, reliance on judicial discretion rather than statutory reform leads to inconsistent outcomes.⁴⁴ The absence of a trauma-informed legislative approach places an undue burden on survivors and reinforces procedural barriers to justice.

³⁹ International Labour Organization, Convention No. 190 Concerning the Elimination of Violence and Harassment in the World of Work, June 21, 2019.

⁴⁰ S. Sareen & P. Dhingra, POSH Compliance Crisis in India, 12 *NLUJ L. Rev.* 87, 92–95 (2024).

⁴¹ INDIA CONST. arts. 14, 15, 21.

⁴² National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, (2014) 5 S.C.C. 438, 456–57 (India).

⁴³ *Madhavi Vishwanathan v. Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd.*, 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 617, ¶¶ 32–35 (India).

⁴⁴ S. Mehta, Procedural Barriers under POSH, 7 *Indian J.L. & Gender* 201, 210–12 (2021).

7.3 Problematic Conciliation Provision

Section 10 of the Act permits conciliation at the request of the aggrieved woman, provided it does not involve monetary settlement. While intended as an alternative dispute resolution mechanism, this provision has attracted serious criticism for enabling coercive compromises, particularly in hierarchical and male-dominated workplaces.

Empirical studies, including Parmar (2023), indicate that conciliation is often encouraged—or subtly imposed—by employers seeking to avoid reputational damage. In such contexts, “consent” to conciliation may be illusory, shaped by fear of career stagnation, transfer, or victimisation.⁴⁵

The availability of conciliation in cases involving gendered power imbalance risks trivialising sexual harassment and undermines the deterrent function of the Act. Critics argue that workplace sexual harassment, as a violation of fundamental rights, is inherently unsuitable for compromise-based resolution.

7.4 Lack of Legal Expertise in Committees

Although the POSH Act mandates the inclusion of an external member with legal knowledge or experience in women’s issues, this requirement is frequently diluted in practice. Many organisations appoint external members without adequate legal training, independence, or familiarity with inquiry procedures.

As Mehta (2021) observes, poorly constituted committees often commit procedural irregularities such as improper appreciation of evidence, violation of natural justice, reliance on stereotypes, and failure to record reasoned findings. These deficiencies render ICC recommendations vulnerable to judicial invalidation, thereby defeating the objective of speedy and effective redressal.

The absence of mandatory legal training or certification for ICC members exposes a structural contradiction: committees are entrusted with quasi-judicial powers without corresponding institutional capacity.

7.5 Misuse of the Malicious Complaints Clause

Section 14 of the POSH Act provides for action against complainants in cases of malicious or false complaints. While intended to prevent misuse, this provision has attracted sustained criticism for its chilling effect on reporting.

Judicial authorities have clarified that inability to prove allegations does not amount to malicious intent. Nevertheless, the mere presence of this clause has been used—explicitly or implicitly—to discourage complaints, particularly in conservative or hierarchical workplaces. Survivors often fear counter-allegations and reputational harm, reinforcing under-reporting.⁴⁶

The imbalance created by Section 14 undermines the survivor-centric philosophy of the Act and risks re-victimisation through institutional processes.

7.6 Enforcement Failures and Compliance Deficit

Perhaps the most significant weakness of the POSH framework lies in its enforcement deficit. Despite mandatory compliance requirements, empirical data reveals widespread non-compliance across sectors. According to a Forbes India (2022) survey, over 60% of companies lacked a properly functioning Internal Complaints Committee.⁴⁷

Sareen and Dhingra (2024) characterise this as a “compliance crisis,” attributing it to weak monitoring, absence of penalties in practice, and lack of governmental oversight⁴⁸. The Act’s reliance on employers for self-compliance, without robust external audits or inspections, has resulted in symbolic rather than substantive implementation.

⁴⁵ CEDAW, art. 11, Dec. 18, 1979, 1249 U.N.T.S. 13.

⁴⁶ Sareen & Dhingra, *supra* note 2, at 98–100.

⁴⁷ Forbes India, POSH Compliance Survey Report (2022).

⁴⁸ Sareen & Dhingra, *supra* note 2, at 90–94.

7.7 Inadequate Addressal of Digital and Virtual Harassment

The POSH Act was drafted in a pre-digital workplace context and does not explicitly address harassment occurring through digital platforms.⁴⁹ Contemporary workplaces increasingly rely on email, messaging applications, video conferencing tools, and social media, creating new avenues for harassment.

The absence of statutory protocols for:

- abuse during video calls,
- cyber-stalking by colleagues or supervisors, and
- sexually explicit digital communication

creates interpretive uncertainty and enforcement gaps. While courts have attempted to include digital spaces within the definition of “workplace,” the lack of explicit legislative guidance undermines consistency and survivor confidence.

7.8 Absence of a Central Registry or Monitoring Mechanism

The POSH Act does not provide for a centralised national registry to track the constitution of ICs, number of complaints, nature of outcomes, or patterns of non-compliance.⁵⁰ As noted by Jumde and Kumar (2023), this absence severely limits transparency, accountability, and policy evaluation.

Without a central portal, governmental authorities lack reliable data to assess the effectiveness of the Act or identify systemic failures. This data vacuum also hampers evidence-based reform and weakens deterrence.

7.9 Conceptual Ambiguities and Interpretive Inconsistency

Finally, the Act leaves several key terms undefined, including “unwelcome,” “modesty,” and “hostile work environment.” While interpretive flexibility can be beneficial, excessive ambiguity has resulted in inconsistent application across committees and courts.

The absence of statutory guidance increases reliance on subjective moral reasoning and cultural stereotypes, potentially diluting the rights-based orientation of the Act⁵¹. Clearer legislative articulation or authoritative guidelines are necessary to ensure uniformity and fairness in adjudication.

8. The Imperative for Reform: What Changes Are Needed

A decade after its enactment, the POSH Act stands at a critical juncture. While its normative vision remains progressive, empirical evidence, judicial scrutiny, and evolving workplace realities reveal that the Act requires substantial reform to remain constitutionally sound, socially responsive, and institutionally effective. Incremental judicial interpretation alone cannot cure structural deficiencies embedded in the statute.⁵² What is required is a calibrated legislative recalibration that strengthens inclusivity, procedural fairness, enforcement, and technological relevance.

8.1 Make the Law Gender-Neutral

The most pressing reform imperative is the transition from a gender-exclusive to a gender-inclusive framework. The POSH Act currently restricts protection to women, excluding men, transgender persons, and non-binary individuals from its remedial ambit. This exclusion is increasingly incompatible with constitutional equality jurisprudence and contemporary understandings of gender-based violence.⁵³

⁴⁹ Sharma & Shreshth, Digital Workplaces and POSH, 59 *Indian J. Gender Stud.* 145, 148–50 (2024).

⁵⁰ A. Jumde & N. Kumar, Data Deficit under POSH, 18 *NLS Bus. L. Rev.* 61, 64–67 (2023).

⁵¹ Saurabh Kumar Mallick v. Comptroller & Auditor Gen. of India, 2008 SCC OnLine Del 1028, ¶¶ 22–24 (India).

⁵² S. Sareen & P. Dhingra, POSH Compliance Crisis in India, 12 *NLUJ L. Rev.* 87, 94–96 (2024).

⁵³ National Legal Services Authority v. Union of India, (2014) 5 S.C.C. 438, 456–58 (India).

In *NALSA v. Union of India*, the Supreme Court affirmed that gender identity is intrinsic to dignity and autonomy under Articles 14, 15, and 21. A statute that purports to prevent workplace harassment but excludes vulnerable gender identities undermines this constitutional mandate. Extending protection to all genders would not dilute women-centric safeguards but would instead reinforce the Act's rights-based foundation and ensure substantive equality.⁵⁴

8.2 Extend and Humanise the Filing Time Limit

The statutory three-month limitation period for filing complaints must be reconsidered. Sexual harassment often involves trauma, fear of retaliation, professional dependency, and institutional silence, all of which delay reporting. A rigid temporal threshold fails to account for these realities.

Legislative reform should permit flexible extensions based on merit, psychological impact, workplace intimidation, or continuing patterns of harassment.⁵⁵ Codifying trauma-informed discretion would reduce reliance on ad hoc judicial intervention and promote uniform, survivor-centric access to justice.

8.3 Remove or Strictly Limit the Conciliation Provision

Section 10 of the Act, which allows conciliation, remains one of its most controversial provisions. Although conciliation is formally survivor-initiated, institutional pressure, reputational concerns, and power imbalances often convert it into a coercive compromise mechanism.

Reform options include either removing conciliation entirely in cases involving hierarchical relationships or limiting it strictly to written⁵⁶, survivor-initiated requests made after counselling and legal advice. Workplace sexual harassment, as a violation of dignity and equality, should not be treated as a negotiable dispute susceptible to informal settlement.

8.4 Mandate Legal Expertise in ICCs

Given the quasi-judicial nature of Internal Committees, the absence of mandatory legal expertise represents a structural flaw. ICs routinely adjudicate complex questions of evidence, credibility, natural justice, and constitutional rights, yet many lack even basic legal competence.

Legislative amendment should require the compulsory inclusion of a qualified lawyer, retired judicial officer, or legally trained professional on every IC. This reform would significantly reduce procedural errors, enhance the quality of reasoning, and ensure that findings withstand judicial scrutiny.

8.5 Strengthen Penalties and Enforcement Mechanisms

The deterrent value of the POSH Act is weakened by minimal and inconsistently enforced penalties. Monetary fines alone are insufficient to ensure compliance, particularly for large corporations and institutions.

Reform should introduce graduated penalties, including deregistration, suspension of licenses, withdrawal of government benefits, and, in cases of wilful non-compliance or suppression of complaints, employer liability under general criminal law. Strengthening enforcement would signal that workplace safety is a non-negotiable statutory obligation.

8.6 Develop Digital Harassment Protocols

The contemporary workplace is increasingly digital, yet the POSH Act remains silent on technology-mediated harassment. Abuse through emails, messaging applications, video conferencing platforms, and social media has become a dominant mode of misconduct. Specific rules should be framed to address:

⁵⁴ *NALSA v. Union of India*, (2014) 5 S.C.C. 438, 463–65 (India).

⁵⁵ *Madhavi Vishwanathan v. Hindustan Petroleum Corp. Ltd.*, 2020 SCC OnLine Bom 617, ¶¶ 32–35 (India).

⁵⁶ R. Parmar, *Conciliation under POSH: Myth of Choice*, 15 *Economic & Pol. Wkly.* 54, 56–58 (2023).

- harassment during virtual meetings,
- cyber-stalking by colleagues or supervisors,
- admissibility, preservation, and authentication of digital evidence.⁵⁷

Explicit digital protocols would enhance clarity, consistency, and survivor confidence while future-proofing the statute.

8.7 Establish a Central Registry and Monitoring Portal

The absence of a national monitoring mechanism has resulted in a compliance vacuum.⁵⁸ A strengthened central registry—conceptualised as a **SHe-Box 2.0**—should be established to track the constitution of committees, number of complaints, status of inquiries, and enforcement outcomes across sectors.⁵⁹

A centralised dashboard would enhance transparency, enable policy evaluation, and facilitate governmental oversight, transforming the Act from a self-regulated framework into an accountable governance regime.

8.8 Expand Coverage to New and Informal Work Arrangements

The traditional employer-employee model no longer reflects labour realities in platform-based and gig economies. Workers engaged through digital platforms, aggregators, and home-based arrangements remain inadequately protected.

Legislative reform must explicitly extend coverage to gig workers, platform-mediated service providers, and domestic or home-based workers, ensuring that protection against harassment is linked to the nature of work rather than the form of contract.⁶⁰

8.9 Introduce Robust Whistleblower and Witness Protection

Fear of retaliation remains one of the most significant barriers to reporting.⁶¹ The POSH Act does not provide comprehensive protection to complainants, witnesses, or committee members against victimisation, transfers, adverse appraisals, or social exclusion.

A statutory whistleblower protection clause should be introduced to safeguard all participants in the redressal process. Without such protection, procedural rights remain illusory, and institutional silence is perpetuated.

9. Conclusion

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 provides a robust and constitutionally sound framework for addressing workplace sexual harassment in India. Its comprehensive definitions, institutional mechanisms, and procedural safeguards are sufficient to ensure safe and dignified workplaces if implemented in their true spirit. The persistent gap lies not in legislative design but in weak and inconsistent implementation.

In practice, non-functional Internal Committees, inadequate training, procedural lapses, and poor administrative oversight continue to undermine the effectiveness of the Act. Employer obligations are frequently treated as formal compliance requirements rather than substantive duties, while monitoring by State authorities remains limited. These failures dilute the Act's preventive purpose and erode trust in internal redressal mechanisms.

Effective implementation requires institutional commitment, regular capacity-building of committees, strict adherence to procedural standards, and active governmental monitoring. Courts have repeatedly clarified that non-implementation constitutes a violation of fundamental rights, but judicial intervention cannot substitute for organisational responsibility. The success of the POSH Act ultimately depends on transforming statutory obligations into everyday workplace practice, ensuring that the right to work with dignity is meaningfully realised rather than merely legislated.

⁵⁷ Saurabh Kumar Mallick v. Comptroller & Auditor Gen. of India, 2008 SCC OnLine Del 1028, ¶¶ 22–24 (India).

Sharma & Shreshth, Digital Workplaces and POSH, 59 *Indian J. Gender Stud.* 145, 148–50 (2024).

⁵⁸ A. Jumde & N. Kumar, Data Deficit under POSH, 18 *NLS Bus. L. Rev.* 61, 64–67 (2023).

⁵⁹ Ministry of Women & Child Development, SHe-Box Portal Guidelines (India).

⁶⁰ ILO Convention No. 190, art. 2, June 21, 2019.

⁶¹ Forbes India, POSH Compliance Survey Report (2022).