RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS IN INDIAN EMPLOYMENT LAW: BALANCING EMPLOYER PROTECTION AND EMPLOYEE MOBILITY

Probeen Khamrui, BA LLB, Rizvi Law College, Mumbai

ABSTRACT

Is it possible for an employer to stop a former worker from joining a rival company? Is it possible for private company information to be safeguarded after a person's job ends without limiting their ability to make a living? The Indian legislation governing restrictive covenants is centred on these issues. Employment contracts now frequently contain non-compete, confidentiality, and trade secret clauses intended to protect corporate interests as companies rely more and more on proprietary information, client connections, and specialized human capital. However, the underlying principle reflected in Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, which nullifies agreements in restraint of trade, sometimes conflicts with such contractual protections. The judicial strategy used by Indian courts to resolve this conflict between employee mobility and employer protection is examined in this article. The article traces the development of Indian jurisprudence on restrictive employment covenants through an examination of significant rulings such as Niranjan Shankar Golikari v. Century Spinning & Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co., Superintendence Company of India (P) Ltd. v. Krishan Murgai, Percept D'Mark (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Zaheer Khan, American Express Bank Ltd. v. Priya Puri, VFS Global Services Pvt. Ltd. v. Suprit Roy, and Diljeet Titus v. Alfred Adebare. It shows how courts have repeatedly recognized the necessity to preserve trade secrets and sensitive information while making a distinction between restrictions that apply during employment and those that continue after it ends. According to the analysis, Indian law aims to carefully distinguish between legal business protection and illegal limitations on professional freedom rather than categorically rejecting restrictive covenants. By doing thus, the piece draws attention to the judiciary's ongoing efforts to strike a balance between business realities and the larger public policy that supports occupational freedom and economic mobility. Important insights into the boundaries of contractual autonomy in employment relationships and the potential legal regulation of loyalty, secrecy, and competitiveness are provided by the ensuing body of jurisprudence.

In industries where companies rely significantly on proprietary technology, customer relationships, private information, and specialized human resources, restrictive covenants have become an essential aspect of contemporary employment contracts. In order to protect their legitimate business interests and avoid unfair competitive advantage, employers frequently include non-compete, confidentiality, and trade secret clauses in employment agreements. However, an equally important legal principle, the freedom to pursue a legitimate career and make a living without unjustified limitations, often clashes with these contractual guarantees. As a result, Indian courts have frequently been asked to balance these conflicting interests, producing a complex body of case law that separates legally binding contracts from agreements that illegally restrict trade.

Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, 1872, which states that any agreement prohibiting an individual from engaging in a lawful profession, trade, or business is null and void, with the exception of the narrow statutory exception pertaining to the sale of goodwill, is the main source of the legal framework governing restrictive covenants in India. The provision's language seems absolute at first, implying that any employment restriction in a contract would not be enforceable. However, judicial interpretation has shown that the clause cannot be implemented in a mechanical manner. Rather, courts have routinely made a distinction between limitations that apply while an employment relationship is in effect and those that do not. While the latter are typically viewed as unlawful limitations on an individual's freedom to pursue lawful employment, the former may be enforceable if they are required to ensure faithful performance of contractual duties.

The easiest way to understand this discrepancy is to look at how non-compete agreements that are in effect while employment are treated by the courts. Indian courts have acknowledged that an employer who hires, develops, and spends a significant amount of money in a worker has a right to anticipate that worker would work solely for the company for the duration of the contract. Therefore, rather than limiting future career options, a condition prohibiting an employee from concurrently working for a competitor during employment serves to maintain the integrity of the contractual relationship.

The Supreme Court's ruling in *Niranjan Shankar Golikari v. Century Spinning & Manufacturing Co.*, *A.I.R. 1967 S.C. 1098*[1].. is the primary authority on this concept. Ltd. The

[1] *Niranjan Shankar Golikari v. Century Spinning & Manufacturing Co., A.I.R. 1967 S.C. 1098*

disagreement started when the worker signed a contract committing him to work for the company for a predetermined amount of time after receiving specialized technical training from the business. The employee tried to leave the company and join a rival business before the agreed-upon term was up. The employer requested an injunction to uphold the negative covenant in the employment contract, arguing that allowing the employee to work for a rival company during the term of the contract would be detrimental to both the agreement and the employer's significant investment in specialized training.

Whether such a covenant constituted an agreement in restraint of trade forbidden by Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act was the main question on the Supreme Court's agenda. The Court dismissed the claim that the legislative prohibition applies to all contractual restrictions on employment. Rather, it noted that a covenant limiting an employee to work for just one employer for the term of a valid contract only guarantees faithful implementation of the parties' freely agreed-upon contractual responsibilities. Such a restriction just governs how the contractual relationship is to be carried out until its natural expiration; it does not permanently deny the employee the freedom to practice a profession.

The Supreme Court recognized the business realities that underlie contemporary employment arrangements in reaching this decision. Employers often spend a lot of money providing specialized training, disclosing private manufacturing techniques, and exposing staff members to sensitive business data. The employer would essentially forfeit the benefit of the agreement if an employee were allowed to leave the company right away after gaining such knowledge and use it for the advantage of a rival company while the contract was still in place. Therefore, rather than stifling competition, the Court acknowledged that reasonable constraints in place during employment safeguard legitimate corporate interests.

Golikari's importance goes far beyond the current controversy. It established the long-lasting principle that limitations that are in place during the continuation of employment are essentially distinct from those that persist after the partnership has terminated. The ruling used a purposive approach that struck a balance between contractual flexibility and business need, rejecting an unduly literal interpretation of Section 27. Golikari is still acknowledged as the primary source confirming that in-service non-compete agreements are often enforceable where they are restricted to the length of employment and rationally related to the employer's legitimate interests, even decades after it was delivered.

The Supreme Court later upheld the logic used in Golikari in *Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co.*, *(1995) 5 S.C.C. 545*[2]., a ruling that made negative covenants' legal standing even more clear. The Court's doctrines have had a considerable impact on employment jurisprudence, even though the dispute originated from a commercial arrangement rather than a traditional contract of employment. During the duration of the contract, one party was compelled to deal only with Coca-Cola products, while dealing with competitor products was forbidden until the contractual relationship ended. Once again, the Supreme Court had to decide whether such a covenant constituted an illegal restraint of commerce when the enforceability of this restriction was contested under Section 27.

The Court noted that not all contractual restrictions are considered mischief under Section 27. Restraints that are in place while a legal contract is in effect must be distinguished from those that remain in place after it is terminated. Negative covenants that are only effective while a contract is in effect are meant to maintain the commercial efficacy of agreements that the parties willingly participate into and to guarantee faithful performance of reciprocal contractual duties. Such provisions do not permanently bar a person from engaging in commerce or preclude future business prospects. Rather, they only govern behavior for the short term of an existing contractual arrangement.

The ruling is especially important since it reiterated that the purpose, duration, and business justification of restrictive covenants are just as important to their legitimacy as their mere existence. The Supreme Court acknowledged that allowing parties to ignore exclusivity commitments right away after signing a contract would seriously compromise contractual certainty. Therefore, post-contractual constraints that aim to limit future economic activity cannot be equated with temporary limits intended to secure contractual performance. When taken as a whole, Niranjan Shankar Golikari and Gujarat Bottling demonstrate the basic idea that not all restrictive covenants are deemed invalid by Indian courts. Instead, they acknowledge that employers have a right to expect loyalty, confidentiality, and exclusive service for the duration of their employment. However, if the job relationship ends, this judicial approach changes significantly. Indian courts have consistently adopted a far more restrictive approach to the enforcement of post-termination non-compete covenants because at that point, the employer's business interests must be balanced against the former employee's freedom to

[2] *Gujarat Bottling Co. Ltd. v. Coca Cola Co., (1995) 5 S.C.C. 545*

pursue a lawful profession.

However, the judiciary's readiness to maintain restrictive covenants only lasts until the contractual connection ends. The balance between safeguarding an employer's business interests and maintaining an employee's vocational freedom drastically changes once employment ends. As of right now, Indian courts have routinely acknowledged that a contractual pledge given to a prior employer does not typically restrict an individual from choosing a lawful career. The public policy that underpins Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, which aims to prevent contractual agreements from needlessly impeding economic mobility or an individual's right to make a living, is the immediate source of this idea. In *Superintendence Co. of India (P) Ltd. v. Krishan Murgai, (1981) 2 S.C.C. 246*[3], a seminal ruling that continues to be one of the most important authorities on post-employment restrictive covenants, the Supreme Court solidified this stance. An employee left the company and started a rival business, which sparked the conflict. In order to safeguard its business interests and clientele, the employer attempted to enforce a clause prohibiting the employee from participating in comparable business activities for a predetermined amount of time following the termination of employment. The Court's main concern was whether a post-termination non-compete agreement could withstand Section 27's statutory ban.

The Supreme Court gave a negative response to this query. It noted that although an employer may rightfully demand loyalty and exclusive service for the duration of employment, these demands cannot last perpetually after the contractual relationship has ended. A restriction that takes effect after termination immediately interferes with a person's ability to find other work and support themselves, which is exactly what Section 27 forbids. The Court dismissed the notion that the enforceability of the restraint should be determined by its reasonableness, pointing out that, in contrast to English common law, the Indian government had purposefully created a harsher legislative framework by declaring agreements in restraint of trade illegal. Therefore, a restrictive covenant cannot be saved from invalidity by its reasonableness alone unless it falls under a recognized statutory exception.

Superintendence Company is significant because it makes a clear contrast between restrictions imposed after termination and contractual loyalty throughout employment. The ruling reiterated that prohibiting a former employee from participating in lawful economic activity

[3] *Superintendence Co. of India (P) Ltd. v. Krishan Murgai, (1981) 2 S.C.C. 246*

cannot safeguard the employer's proprietary interests. Rather, the legislation aims to maintain labour mobility and competitiveness while limiting enforceable limitations to the duration of contractual obligations. The main rule controlling the unenforceability of post-employment non-compete agreements in India is still this ruling.

In *Percept D'Mark (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Zaheer Khan*, *(2006) 4 S.C.C. 227*[4]., the Supreme Court reiterated and reinforced the values. The famous cricketer Zaheer Khan and the sports management organization signed a commercial management agreement, which gave rise to the conflict. Even after the contractual partnership had ended, a stipulation in the deal essentially prevented the cricket player from making comparable agreements with rival agencies. When this clause's enforceability was contested, the Court had to once more consider the extent of Section 27 and decide whether post-contractual limitations could be supported by reasonableness or commercial convenience.

The Supreme Court ruled that a restrictive covenant that lasted longer than the duration of the contract was null and void under Section 27. The Court noted that although parties are normally free to choose the terms of their contractual relationship, this freedom cannot supersede the statutory mandate that forbids agreements in restraint of commerce. The ruling emphasized that unless their continuation is expressly permitted by law, contractual responsibilities end when the agreement is terminated. As a result, a condition that aims to stop someone from pursuing future business prospects after the contract expires would constitute an unlawful trade restriction and be unenforceable.

Percept D'Mark's confirmation that Indian law intentionally deviates from the English concept of reasonable restraint may have been its most significant contribution. Indian courts continue to be primarily guided by the legislative prohibition found in Section 27, whereas English courts frequently assess post-employment restrictions by looking at their reasonableness, geographical scope, and length. As a result, the ruling upheld the general rule that post-contractual non-compete agreements cannot typically be upheld only because they seem fair or commercially acceptable. By doing thus, the Court upheld the public policy that supports professional freedom and confirmed that private contractual agreements cannot restrict a person's ability to follow a legal career.

[4] *Percept D'Mark (India) Pvt. Ltd. v. Zaheer Khan*, *(2006) 4 S.C.C. 227*

While Indian courts have frequently declined to uphold post-employment non-compete agreements, they have acknowledged that employers have a right to safeguard proprietary business assets, trade secrets, and private information. Therefore, the law makes a distinction between prohibiting the misuse of sensitive information obtained while employment and prohibiting an employee from competing with a former employer. One of the key characteristics of Indian employment law nowadays is this distinction.

In *American Express Bank Ltd. v. Priya Puri*, 2006[5] SCC Online Del 638, the Delhi High Court thoroughly explored this issue. The case concerned a former employee who worked for the bank and had access to private client data. Allegations surfaced after departing the company that private information and client-related data would be used for the advantage of a rival employer. Therefore, the Court had to decide how much an employer might restrict the use of information obtained while an employee was employed without really prohibiting the individual from seeking work in the future.

The Court made a clear distinction between the general skill, knowledge, experience, and competence that a person naturally picks up while working and true secret information. It noted that an employee cannot be prevented from using professional competence or knowledge gained over years of service, even while proprietary databases, customer information, private financial records, internal business strategies, and trade secrets need legal protection. Such knowledge cannot become the employer's permanent property as it is a component of the individual's personal talent. Therefore, by acknowledging that secrecy duties may persist after termination as long as they are focused on safeguarding proprietary information rather than actually barring future employment, the ruling struck a delicate balance.

The Delhi High Court took a similar stance in *VFS Global Services. Pvt. Ltd. v. Suprit Roy, 2008 SCC OnLine Bom 1219*[6] Allegations that a former employee had misused private company information after leaving the company were at the centre of the disagreement. The Court reaffirmed that Indian law does not prevent the enforcement of duties protecting personal information just because employment has ended while taking into account the employer's plea for injunctive relief. These duties, however, cannot be written or implemented in a way that essentially establishes a covert non-compete clause. As a result, the Court acknowledged that

---

[5] *American Express Bank Ltd. v. Priya Puri*, 2006

[6] *VFS Global Services. Pvt. Ltd. v. Suprit Roy, 2008 SCC OnLine Bom 1219*

companies have the right to protect trade secrets and confidential information, but that protection must be reasonable and cannot be used to prevent someone from accepting a job offer from a rival company.

In *Diljeet Titus v. Alfred A. Adebare*, *2006 SCC OnLine Del 1368*[7], the distinction between an employee's personal competence and secret knowledge was further explained. Allegations regarding the unauthorized use of proprietary papers and private client information following the conclusion of a professional engagement gave rise to this case. The Delhi High Court acknowledged that important corporate assets that can be legally protected include client databases, proprietary work products, confidential documents, and commercially sensitive information. Simultaneously, the Court reiterated that employers are not allowed by law to monopolize the professional expertise, legal expertise, or experience that an individual has acquired during their employment. As long as they don't misuse trade secrets or private information belonging to their former business, employees are still allowed to use their education, experience, and professional competence in future employment. Together, these rulings show that Indian courts have continuously tried to carefully balance two conflicting legal interests. Employers have the right, on the one hand, to safeguard proprietary company assets, secret information, and legitimate commercial interests that have been created over years of investment and ingenuity. However, just because an employee has relevant professional expertise from prior employment does not mean that they should be denied the fundamental choice to choose lawful employment. As a result, even though Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act generally renders post-employment non-compete agreements unenforceable, confidentiality obligations and trade secret protections are still recognized by the courts when they are specifically designed to protect legitimate proprietary interests rather than function as indirect trade restrictions.

The development of this body of law demonstrates that Indian employment law does not aim to provide absolute advantages to either employers or employees. Rather, it aims to maintain a fair equilibrium by safeguarding business secrecy without sacrificing a person's ability to advance in their career. Non-compete clauses and confidentiality covenants are consistently distinguished by judges in an attempt to maintain contractual protections that are commensurate with the justifiable interests they are intended to protect. These legal precepts continue to be crucial in deciding whether restrictive covenants are enforceable and serve as a

[7] *Diljeet Titus v. Alfred A. Adebare*, *2006 SCC OnLine Del 1368*

guide for employers, employees, and legal professionals alike as employment relationships change in more knowledge-driven businesses.

The discussion concerning the enforceability of non-compete agreements frequently attracts more attention than the important doctrinal development revealed by the aforementioned court rulings. While Indian courts have often declared post-employment constraints unlawful under Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act, they have also increased the protection afforded to employers through trade secret jurisprudence and secrecy duties. This presents a crucial analytical question: has the judiciary's failure to uphold post-employment non-compete agreements essentially made confidentially legislation the main tool used by employers to safeguard their justifiable business interests?

This article's study indicates that the answer is mostly in the yes. Indian courts have deliberately made a distinction between limiting competition and preventing the exploitation of proprietary information, rather than leaving employers without legal protection. Former employees are still free to work for rival companies, but they are not allowed to legally use trade secrets, client databases, proprietary procedures, or private information they learned while working there. Therefore, rather than imposing broad restrictions on professional mobility, the jurisprudence indicates a purposeful court preference for safeguarding legitimate corporate interests through specific secrecy responsibilities. In doing so, Indian courts have made an effort to uphold the public policy that underpins Section 27 while guaranteeing the continued legal protection of private knowledge and economic innovation.

CONCLUSION

The development of Indian employment jurisprudence shows that Indian courts have revised the legal framework that allows for employer protection rather than rejecting it. The judiciary has historically favoured protecting trade secrets and confidential information while maintaining an individual's freedom to pursue lawful employment, rather than allowing contractual limitations that prohibit former employees from competing. This strategy is an attempt to balance the public policy outlined in Section 27 of the Indian Contract Act with business necessity. This distinction is expected to be crucial to the future evolution of restrictive covenant jurisprudence in India as employment relationships continue to change in increasingly knowledge-driven businesses.