



JUDICIAL CREATIVITY AND SECTION 33

Adapting Worker Protections to a Changing Economy

B. Nidhi Rathore, Student, University of Mumbai, Mumbai, India

Abstract : This paper examines judicial creativity in interpreting Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, balancing worker rights and employer autonomy. It traces the shift from strict labour protection to a pragmatic approach, addressing challenges posed by economic liberalisation, gig work, and AI-driven employment. Through case laws and a mock Supreme Court judgment (2035), the paper showcases loopholes and argues for legislative reforms for a transition to fair labor practices in a changing economy.

IndexTerms - Judicial creativity, Section 33, Industrial Disputes Act 1947, labor law, worker rights, employer rights, gig economy, AI-driven employment, judicial activism, labor disputes, case law, automation, legislative reform, industrial stability.

INTRODUCTION

How monotonous and riddled with problems would a world be, where laws remain rigid, unable to adapt to new challenges. Would justice truly be served? This is where judicial creativity steps in, by allowing courts to interpret laws beyond their literal meaning to fill gaps, resolve ambiguities, and keep up with changing societal needs.

Judges wield different tools of judicial creativity to interpret labor laws and industrial disputes, so that fairness remains a part of an ever-evolving economy. Some rulings stick rigidly to the text (the Literal Rule), applying laws as written, even if the outcome is harsh.

Others take a more pragmatic approach, like the Golden Rule, by tweaking literal meanings to avoid absurdity. The Mischief Rule digs into a law's original intent to prevent unfair loopholes, while the Purposive Approach prioritizes broad intent over rigid wording. Without these interpretations, unreformed laws could jeopardize worker protections.

Judicial Discretion in Labour Laws

If labour laws were a building, Judicial discretion would be the concrete cement holding its bricks together. It is crucial in industrial disputes, while considering both worker protection and business viability. It helps in balancing worker rights with employer needs.

Labor markets are constantly evolving with new workplace trends, upcoming industries, and shifting economic conditions. If laws remain rigid, they can quickly become outdated. This would serve as a roadblock in protecting workers and businesses from functioning effectively.

By interpreting laws with flexibility, courts can let decisions and interpretations be at par with modern workplace realities. They prevent strict applications of the law from leading to unjust outcomes. The judiciary maintains industrial harmony, and promotes equitable solutions in labor disputes.

Decoding Section 33

Section 33 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (hereinafter referred to as "the act") is designed to protect workers from unfair treatment while an industrial dispute is underway. Employers cannot alter service conditions or dismiss employees without prior approval. This is done for preventing retaliation or undue influence over the dispute's outcome.

The law is structured to maintain fairness:

Sub-section (1): Employers cannot change working conditions or dismiss employees without tribunal approval.

Sub-section (2): If an employer needs to take action unrelated to the dispute, they must get prior consent from the tribunal.

Sub-section (3): Trade union leaders receive extra protection to prevent unfair targeting during disputes.

The purpose of these provisions is clear. It is to prevent victimization of workers and facilitate a fair industrial dispute resolution. By maintaining the status quo during conflicts, the section aids in making sure that employers cannot misuse their authority to influence legal proceedings.

A Law Born from Industrial Chaos

After independence, industrial disputes were rampant, leading to strikes and instability. Section 33 was introduced to prevent employer retaliation against workers engaged in disputes, ensuring industrial peace. Courts have since played a key role in interpreting its scope, balancing worker rights and business interests.

Activism or Overreach?

Judicial creativity is essential in filling legislative gaps, but how far should courts go? In *Jaipur Zila Sahakari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. v. Ram Gopal Sharma*, the Supreme Court voided dismissals made without prior approval, reinforcing worker protection. However, some argue that excessive judicial intervention can encroach on legislative authority. With labor laws evolving, the debate continues: Should courts keep shaping Section 33, or is legislative reform overdue?

The Changing Interpretations of Section 33

- Early Years (1950s–1970s):

Initially, courts strictly enforced procedural compliance to prevent employer exploitation. In *National Coal Co. v. L.P. Dave (1956)*, reducing wages was deemed an alteration in service conditions, requiring tribunal approval. This set a precedent for strong worker protections.

- Mid-Evolution (1980s–2000s): Balancing Rights and Managerial Authority

By the 1980s, courts acknowledged managerial prerogatives while still upholding due process. In *Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd. v. Shobrani Khan (1959)*, the Supreme Court permitted worker dismissals for misconduct, shifting towards case-specific evaluations rather than automatic worker favoritism.

- Modern Era (2000s–Present): Emphasis on Economic Growth

With globalization, courts granted businesses greater autonomy. In *G.K. Sengupta v. Hindustan Construction Co. Ltd. (1994)*, a worker's dismissal for misconduct was upheld, provided a fair inquiry had been conducted. Today, judicial interpretation balances employee protections with economic realities, reflecting a more pragmatic approach to Section 33.

Economic Liberalization and Challenges

- Worker Protections to Pro-Business Reforms

Before 1991, labor laws heavily favored workers. Factories with 100+ employees needed government approval for layoffs, ensuring job security. However, post-liberalization, businesses demanded greater flexibility to boost investment and efficiency. The National Commission on Labour (2002) recommended increasing the lay off approval threshold to 300 employees ([PRS India](#)).

- A Legal Void

Gig workers—like ride-sharing drivers and delivery agents—fall outside traditional labor protections. Section 33 does not apply to gig workers, classified as independent contractors rather than employees. This denies them job security, social security, and collective bargaining rights, fueling debates on whether the definition of "workman" should be expanded ([GLS Law Journal](#)).

Judicial Response to Gig Work

Courts have sometimes recognized gig workers as de facto employees based on their dependence on platforms. However, Section 33 remains largely ineffective in addressing gig economy challenges, necessitating urgent reforms ([GLS Law Journal](#)).

Time for Reform?

Section 33 has historically protected workers, but its relevance in today's economy is diminishing. With gig work rising, urgent legal changes are required to ensure fair treatment in employer-employee relationships.

When Protection Isn't Enough

Unprotected Workforce

The gig economy employs 7.7 million workers, expected to reach 23.5 million by 2029–30 ([Dell Report](#))

. Yet, they lack:

- Job security—no legal recourse against arbitrary termination.
- Social security benefits—no pensions, insurance, or unemployment cover ([ISB Report](#)).
- Structured dispute resolution mechanisms, leaving them at the mercy of employer algorithms.

Women in the Workforce

10% of women report workplace discrimination, with 60% of cases involving male perpetrators ([StatCan Report](#)).

- 34.2% of women work part-time, often with fewer protections than full-time employees ([ILO Report](#)).
- Pregnancy-related terminations remain common, often masked as cost-cutting measures.

Disabled Workers

Only 36% of disabled men and 8% of disabled women are employed ([UN Women Report](#))

- Lack of accessibility and accommodations force many out of jobs ([Sri Ramakrishna Hospital Report](#)).
- Section 33 was never designed to protect disabled workers, creating a massive legal gap.

Future-Proofing Labor Laws

Challenges in Reforming Section 33

1. Resistance from Employers: Businesses argue that expanding Section 33 would increase compliance costs.
2. Judicial Hesitation: Unlike courts in the UK/EU, Indian rulings still classify gig workers as independent contractors, excluding them from labor laws.
3. Delays: The Code on Social Security, 2020 introduced gig worker protections, but implementation remains slow

Proposed Reforms

1. Expand Scope to Include Gig, Contract, and Platform Workers

Redefining "workman" under Section 33 will make sure gig workers and contract employees are not arbitrarily dismissed.

2. Fast-Track Labor Courts: Justice Delayed is Justice Denied

60% of labor disputes take over a year to resolve (Economic Survey of India). Specialized labor courts should resolve Section 33 disputes within 90 days.

3. Strengthen Protections for Women & Disabled Workers

- Amend Section 33 to explicitly ban dismissals based on gender, disability, or pregnancy.

4. Balance Worker Rights and Business Needs

- Due process before dismissals.
- Prevent excessive regulations from discouraging job creation.

Section 33 and the Future of Work

Section 33 was revolutionary in 1947, but it no longer aligns with modern labor challenges. Without reforms, gig workers, contract employees, women, and disabled workers will remain vulnerable. It is for time and reform to tell if judicial creativity would continue shaping Section 33, or if it is time for a complete legislative overhaul

A Hypothetical Supreme Court Ruling

How would the legal world pan out, if AI decides who gets to work and who gets fired, without explanation, without recourse. In 2035, as gig work dominates the economy, the Supreme Court faces a historic question: Can AI-driven dismissals bypass labor laws?

This mock judgment envisions how courts might redefine worker rights in the digital age.

Case Name: *All India Gig Workers Union v. TechRide Pvt. Ltd.*

Citation: 2035 SCC OnLine SC 1083

Bench: Chief Justice A. Mehta, Justice R. Iyer, and Justice S. Krishnan

Date of Judgment: 24th March 2035

The Case

TechRide Pvt. Ltd., an app-based transport company, terminated 5,000 gig workers during a wage dispute, arguing they were not "workmen" under Section 33. The case raised key issues: Should gig workers be protected under labor laws, and can AI-based dismissals bypass legal scrutiny?

Court's Stance

The Supreme Court ruled in favor of the gig workers, expanding the definition of "workman" to include gig, contract, and AI-managed employees.

- AI-driven dismissals require prior tribunal approval under Section 33.
- Gig workers were functionally employees, despite being labeled contractors.
- Algorithmic control is employer control—AI cannot be used to sidestep labor laws.

Impact of the Ruling

- TechRide must reinstate the 5,000 dismissed workers.
- An AI-Labor Tribunal will assess AI-based dismissals within 30 days.
- Parliament must amend labor laws to address automation and gig work.

Technology cannot be used to weaken worker rights, and this sets a global precedent for fair treatment in the digital economy.

This hypothetical judgment in 2035 is a depiction of how courts might evolve in balancing worker rights with technological progress.

- AI and automation will play a major role in employment decisions.
- Judicial creativity will need to redefine "employment" to include gig and digital workers.
- Balancing innovation with worker protections will become the biggest legal challenge in labor law.

While labor laws were designed for the industrial era, future courts must reinterpret them for a digital, AI-driven economy. Section 33 must not remain stagnant—it must evolve to protect the future workforce.

Evolution or Obsolescence?

As workplaces evolve, so must the laws that protect workers. Section 33 was once a pillar of labor security. But now, it struggles to address gig work, AI-driven employment, and industrial flexibility. Courts have played a crucial role in expanding protections, but legislative reform is overdue. The question isn't whether Section 33 should change but how fast we can adapt it to today's workforce.

Will policymakers act, or will judicial creativity continue shaping labor rights? The future of worker protection in India depends on the answer.

Endnotes**Statutes and Legal Provisions**

1. Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, s 33.
2. Code on Social Security, 2020.
3. National Commission on Labour, 2002 (Recommendation on employment thresholds for layoffs).

Case Laws

4. National Coal Co. v. L.P. Dave, AIR 1956 SC 213.
5. Sasa Musa Sugar Works (P) Ltd. v. Shobrati Khan, AIR 1959 SC 923.
6. Jaipur Zila Sahakari Bhoomi Vikas Bank Ltd. v. Ram Gopal Sharma, (2002) 2 SCC 244.
7. G.K. Sengupta v. Hindustan Construction Co. Ltd., AIR 1994 SC 1280.
8. Dharangadhara Chemical Works Ltd. v. State of Saurashtra, AIR 1957 SC 264.
9. John D'Souza v. Karnataka State Road Transport Corporation, (2001) 9 SCC 189.
10. Martin Burn Ltd. v. R.N. Banerjee, AIR 1958 SC 79.
11. Punjab National Bank Ltd. v. Its Workmen, AIR 1960 SC 160.
12. Union of India v. Rajasthan Annushakti Karamchari Union Rawatbhata, AIR 1976 SC 126.

Reports, Surveys, and Research Papers

13. Economic Survey of India (2023), <https://www.indiabudget.gov.in/economicssurvey/> (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).
14. Dell Foundation Report (2021), "Unlocking the Potential of the Gig Economy in India", <https://www.dell.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/Unlocking-the-Potential-of-the-Gig-Economy-in-India-Full-Report.pdf> (Accessed: 6th Feb 2025).
15. India's Gig Economy: Challenges & Opportunities, ISB Report (2024), <https://blogs.isb.edu/bhartiinstitute/2024/09/03/indias-gig-economy-challenges-opportunities-the-future/> (Accessed: 4th Feb 2025).
16. PRS India, "Overview of Labour Law Reforms", <https://prsindia.org/billtrack/overview-of-labour-law-reforms> (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).
17. ILO Report on Global Employment Trends for Women (2023), https://www.ilo.org/global/about-the-ilo/newsroom/news/WCMS_842505/lang-en/index.htm (Accessed: 6th Feb 2025).
18. StatCan Report on Workplace Discrimination (2024), <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/240104/dq240104b-eng.htm> (Accessed: 4th Feb 2025).
19. Harvard Kennedy School Report on Women and Work in India (2022), <https://www.hks.harvard.edu/publications/women-and-work-india-descriptive-evidence-and-review-potential-policies> (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).
20. BBC Report on Wage Disparity in India (2023), <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-india-62901550> (Accessed: 6th Feb 2025).
21. Oxfam India Report on Wage Disparity (2023), <https://d1ns4ht6ytuzzo.cloudfront.net> (Accessed: 4th Feb 2025).
22. UN Women Report on Disability and Employment in India (2023), https://www.unwomen.org/sites/default/files/2024-09/b30_report_india_en.pdf (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).
23. Sri Ramakrishna Hospital Report on Workplace Accessibility (2023), <https://www.sriramakrishnahospital.com> (Accessed: 6th Feb 2025).
24. Reuters Report on Workplace Violence in India (2024), <https://www.reuters.com/world/india/before-kolkata-doctor-rape-an-unmet-promise-keep-physicians-safe-2024-09-02/> (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).
25. GLS Law Journal, "Challenges in Labour Laws and the Gig Economy", <https://glslawjournal.in> (Accessed: 4th Feb 2025).
26. Drishti IAS Report on Gig Worker Conditions (2024), <https://www.drishtiiias.com> (Accessed: 6th Feb 2025).
27. IBA Report on Workplace Inclusion for Disabled Workers (2024), <https://www.ibanet.org/disability-inclusion-workplace-india> (Accessed: 5th Feb 2025).