THE ROLE OF THE JUDICIARY IN SEXUAL HARASSMENT CASES: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF POSH IMPLEMENTATION IN GOVERNMENT WORKPLACES

Dr Rakhy RS, Assistant Professor, Government Law College, Thiruvananthapuram

ABSTRACT

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (POSH Act) provides a statutory framework for preventing and addressing workplace sexual harassment in India. Its development, however, cannot be understood without examining the judiciary's contribution. In Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, the Supreme Court treated workplace sexual harassment as a violation of constitutional guarantees of equality, non-discrimination and dignity, and issued guidelines that operated until Parliament enacted legislation. Later decisions, particularly Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India and Aureliano Fernandes v. State of Goa, have reinforced the need for meaningful implementation, fair inquiry procedures and institutional accountability. This article examines the judiciary's role in shaping the legal framework, interpreting the POSH Act and addressing compliance failures in public employment. It also considers the limits of judicial intervention, including dependence on executive implementation, barriers to reporting and the risk of treating formal committee constitution as sufficient compliance. It argues that judicial oversight remains essential, but sustainable workplace safety requires properly constituted Internal Committees, trained personnel, timely inquiries, protection against retaliation and transparent institutional monitoring.

Keywords: POSH Act; workplace sexual harassment; judiciary; Vishaka guidelines; Internal Committee; gender justice; government employment; constitutional rights.

Introduction

Workplace sexual harassment is not simply a private dispute between an employee and an employer. It can undermine dignity, restrict equal participation in professional life and discourage women from remaining in, or entering, employment. These concerns are particularly significant in government offices. Public authorities are employers, but they are also institutions bound by constitutional standards of equality, fairness and accountability. Their response to complaints should therefore reflect the standards they are expected to uphold in public administration.

The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013 (the POSH Act) established a statutory system for prevention, prohibition and redressal. It requires covered workplaces to establish Internal Committees (ICs) and provides for Local Committees at the district level in circumstances specified by the Act. The legislation followed a period in which the Supreme Court's decision in Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan supplied the principal framework for addressing workplace harassment in the absence of a dedicated statute.

The existence of legislation does not, by itself, guarantee effective protection. A committee may be absent, improperly constituted or insufficiently trained; an inquiry may be delayed; confidentiality may be compromised; or recommendations may not be acted upon. Such failures can be especially difficult to challenge where the respondent occupies a senior position or the complainant depends on the same institution for continued employment. Judicial review becomes important when administrative systems fail to comply with legal requirements.

This article examines the judiciary's contribution to workplace sexual-harassment law, with particular attention to public-sector workplaces. It considers the constitutional foundation of the framework, the influence of leading Supreme Court decisions, judicial interpretation of the POSH Act, and the role of courts in monitoring compliance. It then evaluates the limits of litigation as a tool for institutional change.

Constitutional Foundations: Dignity, Equality and Access to Work

The Constitutional understanding of workplace sexual harassment has developed through the interaction of equality, dignity and occupational freedom. Articles 14 and 15 of the

Constitution are central to this analysis. Article 14 guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws, while Article 15 prohibits discrimination on specified grounds, including sex. Harassment that makes a workplace hostile or humiliating may prevent women from enjoying equal opportunities in practice, even where formal employment rules appear neutral.

Article 21, which protects life and personal liberty, has been interpreted to protect human dignity. In the workplace context, dignity cannot be separated from the ability to perform professional duties without unwelcome sexual conduct, intimidation or humiliation. Article 19(1)(g), which protects the freedom to practise a profession or carry on an occupation, also provides relevant context: a formally available job opportunity is of limited value if harassment makes it unsafe or effectively inaccessible.

In Vishaka, the Supreme Court connected workplace sexual harassment with violations of fundamental rights, including equality and the right to life with dignity. The Court's approach recognised that sexual harassment is not merely misconduct to be managed internally. It can also be a structural barrier to women's participation in public and professional life. In Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, the Court reinforced the importance of protecting women's dignity and rejected the suggestion that the absence of physical contact necessarily defeats an allegation of sexual harassment.

International human-rights standards also informed this development. In Vishaka, the Court relied on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), using international norms to interpret constitutional guarantees in the absence of inconsistent domestic law. This illustrates how international commitments can assist constitutional interpretation, although their use must remain consistent with the Constitution and applicable legislation.

A rights-based approach has practical implications. The law must provide an accessible complaint process, a fair inquiry, appropriate confidentiality and protection against retaliation. It must also respect procedural fairness for the respondent. The constitutional objective is not achieved by assuming that every allegation is proved, nor by treating complaints as institutional inconveniences. It requires a credible process capable of examining allegations impartially and producing reasoned outcomes.

Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan: The Judicial starting point

The Supreme Court's decision in Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan is the starting point for modern Indian workplace sexual-harassment law. The case arose in the context of the sexual violence suffered by Bhanwari Devi, a grassroots worker associated with Rajasthan's Women's Development Programme. The proceedings brought before the Court raised a broader question: how could the constitutional rights of working women be protected when Indian law did not yet provide a specific, comprehensive framework for workplace sexual harassment?

The Court held that sexual harassment at work was inconsistent with constitutional guarantees, including Articles 14, 15 and 21, and affected women's ability to work with dignity. In response to the legislative gap, it formulated the Vishaka Guidelines. These guidelines were binding until suitable legislation was enacted and placed responsibility on employers to prevent harassment and establish complaint mechanisms.

The guidelines recognized that harassment could take several forms, including unwelcome physical contact or advances, requests for sexual favours, sexually coloured remarks, showing pornography and other unwelcome physical, verbal or non-verbal conduct of a sexual nature. This was important because it rejected an unduly narrow understanding under which only physical assault could be treated seriously.

The Court also required complaint committees to include women and an external member with relevant experience, helping reduce the risk that complaints would be handled solely by colleagues within the same institutional hierarchy. The external member requirement reflected a concern about independence and credibility, rather than being a merely technical appointment rule. The guidelines also placed preventive responsibilities on employers, making clear that an institution's duty was not exhausted by responding after an incident had occurred.

Vishaka was significant for two connected reasons. First, it translated constitutional principles into practical standards for workplace conduct and complaint handling. Second, it demonstrated that judicial interpretation could provide interim protection where legislative action had not yet supplied an adequate framework. The decision was not a substitute for legislation indefinitely; rather, it established standards that Parliament later developed through the POSH Act, 2013.

Developments after Vishaka

Subsequent decisions clarified and reinforced the principles announced in Vishaka. In Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, the Supreme Court rejected a narrow approach that treated the absence of physical contact as decisive. The judgment recognised that unwelcome conduct and attempts that violate a woman's dignity may constitute serious misconduct even when they do not result in physical assault. Its wider significance lies in the Court's insistence that workplace discipline must be assessed in light of the purpose of protecting women from sexual harassment.

In Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India, the Supreme Court addressed persistent failures to implement the Vishaka Guidelines. The proceedings highlighted the distance between formal recognition of a right and the practical availability of a remedy. The Court emphasised that complaint committees had to function as effective inquiry bodies and that public authorities could not treat the guidelines as optional. The decision illustrates an important feature of judicial oversight: a court may need to return to an issue after issuing a principle because the real challenge lies in implementation.

The enactment of the POSH Act in 2013 moved the framework from judicial guidelines to a statutory regime. The Act specifies institutional responsibilities, committee composition, inquiry procedures, employer duties and consequences for non-compliance. The judiciary's role consequently shifted in emphasis. Courts continue to interpret and enforce the law, but they must do so within the statutory framework and with attention to the respective roles of the legislature, executive and judiciary.

In Aureliano Fernandes v. State of Goa (2023), the Supreme Court expressed serious concern about inadequate implementation of the POSH framework and stressed the importance of awareness, proper constitution of committees and compliance by institutions. The decision is particularly relevant to the public sector because government authorities must not only comply with the law but also demonstrate that statutory safeguards operate in practice.

Interpreting And Applying The POSH Act

The POSH Act gives courts a statutory framework through which to assess institutional conduct. Interpretation should remain faithful to the text and purpose of the legislation. Because

the Act is protective and remedial, courts must avoid interpretations that defeat access to the complaint mechanism through unnecessary technicalities. At the same time, a remedial purpose does not remove the need to follow statutory procedures or to assess evidence fairly.

The definition of "workplace" in Section 2(o) is broad and covers a range of public and private establishments, including relevant government bodies and institutions. Employment-related activity may also take place away from a conventional office, such as during official travel, fieldwork or work-related events. The application of the definition depends on the statutory language and the facts of the case; it should not be assumed that every interaction occurring online or outside office premises automatically falls within the Act.

Section 4 governs the constitution of the Internal Committee. The statutory requirements concerning the Presiding Officer, employee members and external member are intended to support a competent and credible process. A committee that does not meet mandatory composition requirements risks undermining confidence in the inquiry and may expose its findings to legal challenge. Government employers should therefore maintain current appointment orders, ensure that members receive appropriate training and review committee composition whenever membership changes.

Section 11 addresses the inquiry into a complaint and must be read alongside the applicable service rules and principles of natural justice. A fair process ordinarily requires that the parties have a meaningful opportunity to present their cases, that relevant material be considered, and that findings be supported by reasons. The requirement of fairness operates in both directions: the complainant must not be dismissed or intimidated, and the respondent must not be treated as having committed misconduct before the inquiry reaches its conclusion.

Section 16 imposes confidentiality restrictions concerning complaint-related information, subject to the terms of the statute. Confidentiality protects the privacy and dignity of those involved and helps prevent public exposure from discouraging reporting. Section 19 sets out employer duties, including duties relating to a safe working environment and implementation of recommendations in accordance with the Act. Compliance should be assessed against the actual statutory wording rather than a general assumption that every recommendation has the same legal effect in every circumstance.

Judicial scrutiny is most useful when it ensures that these provisions are applied

meaningfully. Courts may examine whether a committee was lawfully constituted, whether the process was fair, whether there was unreasonable delay, and whether the employer performed its statutory obligations. They should not, however, automatically substitute their own assessment of every factual issue for that of a properly constituted inquiry body. The appropriate scope of review depends on the legal defect alleged and the applicable standards of judicial review.

Judicial Oversight of Government Workplaces

Government offices occupy a distinctive position under the POSH framework. Ministries, departments, public-sector undertakings, educational institutions, hospitals and local bodies may fall within the Act's coverage, depending on their legal status and the statutory definition of workplace. As employers, public authorities must fulfil the Act's requirements. As organs of the State, they are also expected to act consistently with constitutional values and the standards of fairness that govern public administration.

Judicial oversight can address failures that internal administrative processes have not corrected. Depending on the circumstances, courts may direct an authority to constitute a compliant committee, reconsider a procedurally defective inquiry, decide a matter within a reasonable period or comply with statutory obligations. Such orders should be tailored to the proven defect and should preserve the integrity of the inquiry process.

The Supreme Court's decision in Aureliano Fernandes is an important reminder that compliance must be substantive rather than cosmetic. The mere existence of an Internal Committee does not establish that the institution has created an effective system. The committee must be properly constituted, its members must understand their responsibilities, and employees must know how to make a complaint. Institutions should also have procedures for receiving complaints, preserving records, protecting confidentiality and acting on outcomes in accordance with law.

Courts may use affidavits, reports and other compliance mechanisms where legally appropriate to determine whether public authorities have implemented their directions. Such monitoring can expose recurring failures and encourage consistent administrative practice. Yet, the effectiveness of supervision depends on the accuracy of information supplied by institutions and the willingness of responsible officials to implement directions. Periodic reporting is useful

only when it measures actual functioning rather than the formal existence of a committee.

The judiciary's role should therefore be understood as both corrective and catalytic. It can remedy unlawful action in individual cases and articulate standards that guide institutional practice. It cannot, however, replace the everyday responsibilities of employers, district authorities and other bodies tasked with implementing the statute.

Protecting Complainants, Witnesses and Procedural Fairness

A credible redressal system must protect the dignity and safety of complainants while preserving a fair process for everyone involved. Confidentiality is central to this balance. Disclosure of identifying details or sensitive inquiry material may expose a complainant to stigma, reputational damage or workplace isolation. The statutory confidentiality requirement should therefore be observed by committee members, employers and others who handle the proceedings, subject to lawful disclosure requirements.

Retaliation is another serious concern. In a hierarchical workplace, an employee may fear that making a complaint will affect promotion, work allocation, performance assessments or continued employment. Contractual workers and junior employees may be especially reluctant to challenge senior personnel. Employers should take allegations of retaliation seriously and consider lawful interim measures where needed. Such measures must be proportionate, should not prejudge the complaint and should not impose an unfair burden on the complainant.

Witnesses may also be reluctant to participate where they depend professionally on the people involved. Inquiry committees and employers should avoid intimidation and should provide a process in which relevant evidence can be presented without unnecessary exposure. The POSH Act does not create an all-purpose witness-protection system for every workplace situation; any particular protective measure must be grounded in the statute, applicable rules, service conditions or a competent authority's lawful directions.

Sensitivity should not be confused with a departure from procedural fairness. An inquiry should not subject a complainant to irrelevant or humiliating questioning, but the respondent must still have a meaningful opportunity to answer the allegations. The committee should assess evidence impartially, record its reasoning and follow the prescribed procedure.

A trauma-informed approach, adequate training and clear procedural guidance can help reduce avoidable distress without compromising fairness.

Ultimately, protection is broader than punishment after a finding of misconduct. It includes a trustworthy complaint process, safeguards against retaliation, confidentiality, timely handling and appropriate institutional support. These measures can help make the statutory mechanism accessible to employees who might otherwise remain silent.

Challenges and limits of judicial intervention

Judicial intervention has helped establish standards and compel compliance, but it cannot resolve every problem associated with workplace sexual harassment. Litigation can be costly, time-consuming and intimidating. Employees in junior positions, temporary employment or rural locations may lack legal assistance or fear that approaching a court will damage their careers. A system that relies primarily on litigation risks providing its strongest protection to those who are best placed to access legal remedies.

Courts also work largely through disputes brought before them. Even where a court issues general directions, it cannot supervise the daily functioning of every workplace committee across the country. Effective implementation depends on employers, district authorities, relevant government departments and other statutory bodies performing their duties. If those institutions do not maintain records, train committee members or monitor compliance, judicial directions may remain only partly effective.

A further problem is the difference between formal and substantive compliance. An employer may issue an order constituting a committee but fail to ensure that its members are independent, trained or available to perform their duties. Similarly, an awareness programme may be held merely to satisfy a reporting requirement without changing workplace practices. Compliance measures should therefore evaluate not only whether a committee exists, but also whether employees know about it, complaints are processed fairly and statutory duties are fulfilled.

The need for procedural fairness must also remain part of the analysis. The complaint mechanism should protect women from harassment and retaliation without presuming the outcome before the evidence is examined. The possibility of an unsubstantiated complaint is

not the same as proof of a deliberately false complaint. Any finding of malicious intent should be made only in accordance with the statute and the evidence. Careful procedures strengthen, rather than weaken, the legitimacy of the system.

These limitations suggest that judicial intervention should complement—not displace—administrative responsibility. Courts can identify legal failures and require correction. Long-term change, however, also requires leadership commitment, accessible reporting channels, trained committee members, regular audits and an institutional culture in which complaints are handled seriously and impartially.

Critical analysis and recommendations

The development of POSH jurisprudence demonstrates a constructive relationship between constitutional adjudication and legislation. Vishaka responded to a serious legal gap by translating constitutional rights into enforceable workplace standards. Later decisions exposed the limits of relying on guidelines without consistent implementation. Parliament's enactment of the POSH Act then supplied a statutory structure, while courts continued to interpret and enforce its requirements.

This history also demonstrates the limits of judge-made solutions. A judgment can state a binding rule, but its everyday effect depends on the conduct of employers and public authorities. Judicial directions cannot by themselves create a safe workplace culture. The strongest approach is therefore one in which courts preserve statutory rights and review unlawful administrative conduct, while executive institutions accept responsibility for prevention and compliance.

Several practical steps follow from this analysis. First, every covered public institution should periodically review the legal constitution and current membership of its Internal Committee. Second, committee members should receive regular training on statutory duties, evidence assessment, confidentiality, natural justice and sensitive handling of complaints. Third, employees should be informed of the complaint process, relevant contacts and protection against retaliation. Fourth, institutions should maintain accurate, confidential records and monitor whether inquiries and subsequent action comply with the statute. Fifth, compliance reporting should measure the functioning of the mechanism rather than simply count committees or training sessions.

Sixth, authorities should create clear lines of responsibility for acting on committee recommendations and for addressing procedural delays. Seventh, independent review should be available where a genuine question arises about committee composition, conflicts of interest or the fairness of the inquiry. Finally, researchers and policymakers should have access to appropriately anonymised implementation data, consistent with statutory confidentiality, so that recurrent gaps can be identified and addressed.

These recommendations do not require the judiciary to take over administration. Rather, they would allow courts to focus on legal accountability while institutions improve their own systems. A more effective framework depends on the combined efforts of the judiciary, legislature, executive, employers, civil society and employees.

Conclusion

The Indian judiciary has played a foundational role in the legal response to workplace sexual harassment. Through Vishaka, the Supreme Court connected harassment with constitutional guarantees and established binding guidelines at a time when a dedicated statute was absent. Decisions such as A.K. Chopra and Medha Kotwal Lele strengthened the substantive protection and emphasised the need for genuine implementation. The POSH Act, 2013 placed these principles within a statutory framework, and subsequent judicial scrutiny has continued to address failures in compliance.

The central challenge is no longer only the recognition of a legal right. It is ensuring that the mechanisms created to protect that right are accessible, competent, impartial and effective. Improper committee composition, delays, confidentiality breaches and failure to act on lawful recommendations can undermine the purpose of the Act. Such problems are especially serious in government offices, where public authorities are expected to model constitutional accountability.

Judicial oversight remains essential when institutions fail to meet their legal obligations. Yet courts cannot independently supervise every workplace or transform institutional culture through judgments alone. Durable progress requires public employers to take prevention seriously, committees to function professionally, employees to understand their rights, and authorities to implement statutory duties consistently.

The most defensible conclusion is that the judiciary is a necessary guarantor of the POSH framework, but not its sole enforcer. The promise of workplace equality will be realised only when constitutional principles, statutory procedures and everyday administrative practice reinforce one another.

REFERENCES:

1. Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, (1999) 1 SCC 759; AIR 1999 SC 625.

2. Aureliano Fernandes v. State of Goa, (2024) 1 SCC 632; 2023 SCC OnLine SC 621 (judgment dated 12 May 2023).

3. Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India, (2013) 1 SCC 297; AIR 2013 SC 93.

4. Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, (1997) 6 SCC 241; AIR 1997 SC 3011.

5. Constitution of India.

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

7. Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Rules, 2013, G.S.R. 769(E), 9 December 2013.

8. Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, adopted 18 December 1979, 1249 UNTS 13 (entered into force 3 September 1981).

9. India Code, "The Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013", available at https://www.indiacode.nic.in/handle/123456789/17057 (accessed 27 October 2026).

10. Supreme Court of India, Aureliano Fernandes v. State of Goa, Civil Appeal No. 2482 of 2014, judgment dated 12 May 2023, available at https://indiankanoon.org/doc/38950634/ (accessed 27 October 2026).

11. Supreme Court of India, Vishaka v. State of Rajasthan, judgment dated 13 August 1997, available at https://indiankanoon.org/doc/1031794/ (accessed 27 October 2026).

12. Supreme Court of India, Apparel Export Promotion Council v. A.K. Chopra, judgment dated 20 January 1999, available at https://indiankanoon.org/doc/856194/ (accessed 27 October 2026).

13. Supreme Court of India, Medha Kotwal Lele v. Union of India, judgment dated 19 October 2012, reported in (2013) 1 SCC 297.