THE PREVENTION OF SEXUAL HARASSMENT (POSH) ACT, 2013: A HUMAN RIGHTS-BASED ANALYSIS OF INDIA'S WORKPLACE PROTECTION FRAMEWORK

Aditya Narayan Khole, University of Mumbai Law Academy

ABSTRACT

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (POSH Act) represents a landmark legislative intervention in India's legal landscape, emerging from the Supreme Court's Vishaka Guidelines (1997) and India's international obligations under the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW). This paper examines the POSH Act through a human rights lens, analysing its legislative evolution, statutory framework, implementation challenges, and the tension between its protective objectives and its gender-exclusive scope. Drawing upon recent empirical studies, judicial pronouncements, and critical legal scholarship, the paper argues that while the POSH Act establishes a robust framework for addressing workplace sexual harassment, significant gaps persist between legislative intent and practical enforcement. These include widespread non-compliance, inadequate awareness, procedural delays, and the exclusion of marginalized groups—including male victims, transgender persons, and informal sector workers—from statutory protection. The paper concludes by proposing reforms toward a more inclusive, intersectional framework that aligns India's workplace harassment jurisprudence with universal human rights principles.

Keywords: POSH Act, Sexual Harassment, Human Rights, Gender Justice, Workplace Safety, Vishaka Guidelines, CEDAW

1. Introduction

Sexual harassment in the workplace constitutes one of the most pervasive violations of human dignity, equality, and the fundamental right to work in a safe environment. In India, where women's workforce participation remains among the lowest globally, the creation of safe working environments is not merely a matter of legal compliance but a fundamental prerequisite for economic empowerment and social progress. The POSH Act, enacted in 2013, 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.

This paper adopts a human rights-based approach to critically analyze the POSH Act. Rather than treating the Act as a standalone domestic statute, the analysis situates it within India's constitutional framework—particularly Articles 14 (equality), 15 (non-discrimination), 19 (freedom of profession), and 21 (right to life and dignity)—and its international obligations under CEDAW, which India ratified in 1993. This framework recognizes that workplace sexual harassment is not merely an employment issue but a human rights violation that implicates the state's affirmative obligations to protect individuals from gender-based violence and discrimination.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 traces the legislative evolution from the Vishaka Guidelines to the POSH Act. Section 3 analyzes the Act's key provisions and their alignment with human rights principles. Section 4 examines implementation challenges through empirical evidence. Section 5 critically evaluates the gender-exclusive nature of the Act. Section 6 assesses judicial interpretations and recent developments. Section 7 proposes reforms toward a more inclusive framework. Section 8 concludes.

2. Legislative Evolution: From Vishaka to the POSH Act

2.1 The Constitutional and International Law Foundation

The recognition of workplace sexual harassment as a human rights violation in India has its origins in international law. The Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1979 and ratified by India in 1993, establishes sexual harassment as a form of sex-based discrimination that violates women's rights to equality and dignity. General Recommendation No. 19 of the CEDAW

Committee explicitly recognizes that sexual harassment undermines women's equality in employment and constitutes a violation of their human rights.

2.2 The Vishaka Guidelines (1997)

Prior to 1997, India had no domestic law addressing workplace sexual harassment. The absence of legislative action compelled the Supreme Court to intervene. In *Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan* (1997), the Court invoked its constitutional powers to fill the legislative vacuum, holding that the fundamental rights of women under Articles 14, 19, and 21 cannot be realized without a safe working environment. The Court observed: *"The fundamental right to carry on any occupation, trade or profession depends on the availability of a 'safe' working environment…primary responsibility for ensuring such safety and dignity through suitable legislation, and the creation of a mechanism for its enforcement, is of the legislature"*.

The Vishaka Guidelines established a binding framework requiring employers to: (a) prohibit sexual harassment; (b) establish complaints committees; (c) initiate disciplinary action against perpetrators; and (d) ensure victim protection. These guidelines remained in force for sixteen years, serving as the de facto legal standard until parliamentary action.

2.3 The Enactment of the POSH Act, 2013

The POSH Act codified the Vishaka Guidelines into statutory law, establishing a comprehensive framework to prevent, prohibit, and redress workplace sexual harassment. The Act represents what scholars term an "ameliorative social welfare legislation" that warrants purposive interpretation to further its constitutional objectives. The Supreme Court has subsequently recognized that the Act constitutes a "net cast by the Parliament to cover as many establishments as possible," reflecting an expansive legislative intent.

3. Statutory Framework and Human Rights Alignment

3.1 Key Provisions

The POSH Act establishes several core mechanisms:

Internal Committees (ICs): Section 4 mandates that every workplace employing ten or more workers constitute an Internal Committee to receive and adjudicate complaints. The IC must

include a Presiding Officer (a woman employed at a senior level), two employee members committed to women's causes, and one external member from an NGO or legal background.

Complaint Procedure: Sections 9-13 provide a time-bound process for complaint filing (within three months of the incident), conciliation (optional), inquiry (to be completed within 90 days), and report submission (within 10 days of inquiry completion).

Employer Obligations: Section 19 imposes duties on employers, including organizing awareness programs, assisting complainants, and submitting annual compliance reports.

Penalties: Section 26 provides for fines up to ₹50,000 for non-compliance, with potential for license cancellation or registration withdrawal for repeated violations.

3.2 Alignment with Human Rights Principles

From a human rights perspective, the POSH Act incorporates several principles recognized under international law: the right to a remedy (access to complaint mechanisms), the right to non-discrimination (protecting women from sex-based harassment), the right to dignity (recognizing harassment as a violation of personal integrity), and state obligation to prevent and redress violations through employer regulation. The Act's requirement that ICs include external members ensures independence, a crucial safeguard against employer bias.

4. Implementation Challenges: Bridging the Gap Between Law and Practice

Despite its robust framework, empirical evidence reveals significant implementation gaps.

4.1 Compliance Deficits

A study conducted in the Kalyan-Dombivli region found that while 80.4% of organizations had formally implemented POSH policies, only 58.7% conducted awareness programs. More concerning, analysis of 300 NSE-listed companies indicates that reporting remains concentrated among a limited number of organizations, suggesting poor compliance across sectors. The Supreme Court has issued comprehensive directions to state governments to address these gaps, yet enforcement remains inconsistent.

4.2 Awareness and Underreporting

Lack of awareness remains a critical barrier. The Kalyan-Dombivli study identified fear of retaliation and lack of trust in grievance mechanisms as primary obstacles to reporting. This finding aligns with broader patterns: a significant number of cases remain unreported, and reported cases often go uninvestigated. The phenomenon of "adaptive preferences"—where women internalize discriminatory conditions as normal—further compounds underreporting.

4.3 Procedural Delays

While the Act mandates a 90-day inquiry timeline, delays are endemic. Extended proceedings subject complainants to prolonged workplace hostility and psychological distress, undermining the Act's remedial purpose.

4.4 The ICC Effectiveness Problem

Internal Committees vary widely in composition, training, and functioning. Biased or ineffective outcomes remain a significant concern, with some ICs lacking expertise in traumainformed investigation. The concentration of investigative and adjudicative functions within the same committee also raises procedural fairness questions.

5. The Gender Exclusivity Critique: A Human Rights Deficit

The most significant human rights critique of the POSH Act is its gender-exclusive scope: the Act protects only "women" against sexual harassment. This framework raises fundamental questions about equality and non-discrimination.

5.1 Exclusion of Male Victims

The Act's exclusive focus on women as victims oversimplifies the dynamics of harassment and may not adequately address cases where men face harassment. While empirical evidence suggests women are disproportionately affected, the categorical exclusion of male victims creates a protection hierarchy inconsistent with the principle of universal human dignity. Critics argue that the POSH Act's impact-based approach disregards general principles of criminal law that protect all persons equally.

5.2 Exclusion of Transgender and Non-Binary Persons

The Act's binary gender framework excludes transgender and non-binary individuals entirely. This is particularly problematic given that transgender persons face heightened risks of workplace harassment and discrimination. The Transgender Persons (Protection of Rights) Act, 2019, recognizes the right to non-discrimination in employment, yet no corresponding mechanism exists for addressing sexual harassment against transgender persons in the workplace.

5.3 Exclusion of the Informal Sector

The Act applies primarily to the formal sector, leaving a vast number of workers in the informal sector without protection. Given that women in informal employment—domestic workers, agricultural laborers, construction workers—are among the most vulnerable to exploitation, this exclusion represents a significant gap in the protective framework. While the Act's definition of "workplace" includes dwelling houses (recognizing domestic workers), enforcement mechanisms in the informal sector remain virtually nonexistent.

5.4 Intersectional Access Barriers

Research examining CEDAW's application in Indian courts reveals that while relatively privileged women alleging sexual harassment receive favorable outcomes, accessibility issues persist for marginalized groups, including lower-class women and trans women. The CEDAW has been used effectively to create judicial reforms and enforce employer compliance in four cases each, but remains a "paper tiger" for those lacking sufficient resources and societal privileges. This intersectional finding underscores that formal legal protections alone are insufficient without addressing underlying social hierarchies.

6. Judicial Interpretation: Purposivism and Its Limits

The judiciary has generally adopted a purposive approach to interpreting the POSH Act, recognizing its character as social welfare legislation requiring expansive construction.

6.1 Expansive Interpretations

Courts have applied the Act to:

- **Digital spaces** as "workplace" under Section 2(o)
- **Independent contractors** as "employees"
- Women as respondents in certain contexts

The Bombay High Court in *Jaya Kodate v. Rashtrasant Tukdoji Maharaj Nagpur University* (2013) held that the terms "employer" and "employee" should be interpreted as "springs that possess the quality of being stretched or compressed to further the object of the legislation". The inclusion of persons working "whether for remuneration or not, or working on a voluntary basis or otherwise" indicates legislative intent for a wide scope.

6.2 The Political Party Controversy

However, purposivism has limits. On August 1, 2025, the Supreme Court refused to entertain a writ petition seeking application of the POSH Act to political parties, citing the absence of an employer-employee relationship. This stance has been criticized for overlooking the constitutional imperative to protect women in all organizational contexts. As one commentator argues, political parties are "not appendages but the centre of government," and their immunity from the Act perpetuates violence against women in politics. A UN study found that almost 90% of women feel that violence breaks their resolve to join politics.

The Court's reluctance contrasts with its proactive stance in *Vishaka* and the *R.G. Kar Medical College* rape case, where it issued suo moto guidelines despite existing penal laws. Critics suggest that the Court's shift from purposivism to literalism in this context reflects a troubling retreat from its constitutional role as guardian of fundamental rights.

7. The Path Forward: Toward an Inclusive Human Rights Framework

Addressing the identified gaps requires multidimensional reform.

7.1 Legislative Amendments

The POSH Act should be amended to:

- **Adopt gender-neutral protection** extending to all persons regardless of gender identity, recognizing that sexual harassment is a human rights violation

affecting all individuals

- **Explicitly include transgender persons** as protected categories, aligning with the Transgender Persons Act

- **Strengthen informal sector mechanisms** through sectoral complaints committees and mobile-based reporting systems

- **Mandate IC training** on trauma-informed, intersectional approaches **7.2 Enforcement Enhancements**

The compliance deficit requires:

- **Independent auditing** of IC functioning, beyond mere annual report filing

- **Stricter penalties** for non-compliance, including personal liability for senior management

- **Dedicated POSH tribunals** to reduce procedural delays and address IC bias concerns

7.3 Cultural Transformation

Legal reform alone is insufficient. Organizations must move beyond compliance toward cultural change, including:

- **Mandatory, recurring awareness programs** integrated into employee onboarding and annual training

- **Leadership accountability** metrics linking POSH compliance to executive performance evaluations.

- Third-party oversight for IC proceedings to ensure procedural fairness 7.4 Expanding the Judicial Role

Courts should:

- **Apply purposive interpretation consistently**, rejecting narrow employer-employee

requirements where they defeat legislative intent

- **Recognize political parties and other organizational forms** as workplaces under the Act.

- **Develop intersectional jurisprudence** addressing how caste, class, and disability intersect with gender to shape harassment experiences.

8. Conclusion

The POSH Act represents a significant achievement in India's human rights jurisprudence, transforming the Vishaka Guidelines into a comprehensive statutory framework. The Act has established mechanisms for redressal, imposed binding obligations on employers, and created a legal language for recognizing workplace sexual harassment as a violation of fundamental rights.

However, the gap between legislative intent and practical realization remains substantial. Compliance deficits, awareness gaps, procedural delays, and—most fundamentally—the gender-exclusive and formal-sector-limited scope of the Act undermine its transformative potential. For the POSH Act to fulfill its promise of workplace dignity and equality, India must move toward an inclusive human rights framework that protects all workers regardless of gender, recognizes intersectional vulnerabilities, and ensures effective enforcement across all sectors of the economy.

The Supreme Court's observation in *Vishaka* remains pertinent: the right to a safe working environment is not a statutory privilege but a fundamental right. Realizing that right requires not merely structural compliance but fundamental shifts in organizational culture, robust enforcement mechanisms, and a judicial commitment to purposive interpretation that prioritizes human dignity over formalistic limitations.

References

1. Ailani, L. (2025). A Study on Employee Awareness of POSH Act, 2013 with Reference to Kalyan Dombivli Area. *Zenodo*.

2. Tripathi, S. (2025). PoSH, Politics, and Purposivism: A Critique of the Supreme Court's Stance on the PoSH Act. *CCAL Journal*.

3. Amrutha. (2025). Legal Safeguards Against Workplace Harassment: Evaluating Implementation of the POSH Act. *Scilit*.

4. Juneja, S. (2025). India's Prevention of Sexual Harassment Law: A Critical Analysis of Strengths, Weaknesses, and the Path Forward. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local SelfGovernment*.

5. Das, R. (2025). POSH Act 2013: A Pillar for Human Rights at the Workplace – A Critical Analysis. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, 8(6), 49-62.

6. Stephens, A. (2025). Is the Women's Treaty a Paper Tiger? Indian Courts' Application of the United Nations Treaty. *University of Memphis Law Review*, 55(1).

7. Chatwal, R., & Abhyankar, K. (2025). From Genesis to Justice: The Legislative Evolution of POCSO and POSH Act. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, 8(3), 1093-1107.

8. Blitzer, A. (2024). Evaluating the Implementation and Enforcement of India's POSH Act through Surveying Individuals Across Sectors. National Law School of India University.

9. Kanodia, S., & Bhatt, A. (2025). Evaluating the POSH Act, 2013: Gender Justice or Gender Exclusivity. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*, 8(2), 5255-5266.

10. Dwivedi, E., & Tiwari, G. (2024). Gender Justice at Work: Examining the Effectiveness of the Prevention of Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace Act, 2013. In Tomar & Chaudhary (Eds.), *Implementation of Human Rights: International Perspective Issues and Solutions* (pp. 121-130). Universal Academic Books Publishers.