

POLICY PAPER SERIES

IZA Policy Paper No. 218

**Impact of India's New Labour Codes
on Workers**

Santosh Mehrotra
Kingshuk Sarkar

DECEMBER 2025

POLICY PAPER SERIES

IZA Policy Paper No. 218

Impact of India's New Labour Codes on Workers

Santosh Mehrotra

Jawaharlal Nehru University and IZA

Kingshuk Sarkar

Goa Institute of Management

DECEMBER 2025

Any opinions expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) and not those of IZA. Research published in this series may include views on policy, but IZA takes no institutional policy positions. The IZA research network is committed to the IZA Guiding Principles of Research Integrity.

The IZA Institute of Labor Economics is an independent economic research institute that conducts research in labor economics and offers evidence-based policy advice on labor market issues. Supported by the Deutsche Post Foundation, IZA runs the world's largest network of economists, whose research aims to provide answers to the global labor market challenges of our time. Our key objective is to build bridges between academic research, policymakers and society.

IZA Policy Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

ABSTRACT

Impact of India's New Labour Codes on Workers

India introduced sweeping legal changes on labour laws in late 2025, summarising 29 laws into 4 labour Codes. The Key Changes and Concerns Industrial Relations Raises the threshold for requiring government permission for layoffs/retrenchments from 100 to 300 workers, encouraging firms to avoid permanent employees; Introduces “sole negotiating union” requiring 51% worker support; Imposes 14-day notices and prohibitions during conciliation, making legal strikes impossible Wages: Introduces unclear “floor wage” concept without adequate distinction from minimum wage; Lacks mechanism for revising the basic wage component based on changing consumption patterns; Social Security: Maintains 10-worker threshold for provident funds and benefits, excluding most unorganized sector workers; Misses opportunity to universalize social security as a legislative right Occupational Safety: Covers only establishments with 10+ workers, excluding smaller workplaces; The codes represent missed opportunities for genuine labor reform, avoiding issues like job security, collective bargaining rights, fair minimum wages, gender discrimination, and social security—especially for majority of India's workforce in the informal sector.

JEL Classification: J08, J38, J52, J53

Keywords: industrial relations, minimum wages, social security, occupational health, India, labour law

Corresponding author:

Santosh Mehrotra
University of Bath
Claverton Down
Bath BA2 7AY
United Kingdom
E-mail: santoshmeh@gmail.com

Impact of India's New National Labour Codes on Workers

Introduction

After India began economic liberalization in 1991, there was a growing demand for comprehensive labour reforms, often referred to as second-generation reforms, starting in the late 1990s and early 2000s.

However, despite the extensive debate, there was little concrete action until recently when the Central government introduced four labour Codes in Parliament in 2017. These Codes cover four broad categories: wages, industrial relations, social security, and occupational safety and health working conditions. They merged 29 existing labour laws, and passed in parliament in 2019 and 2020. However, they notified the codes only on 21st November, 2025, thus making finally laws of the land, and ready for implementation. We discuss possible repercussions of these Codes below.

Code on Industrial Relations 2020

1. The Code provides flexibility in hiring

This Code stipulates that the requirement to obtain prior permission for industrial establishments with 300 or more workers before implementing lay-offs, retrenchments, or closures represents a significant change. The threshold has been raised from 100 to 300 workers. Historically, we have found that a very high share of organized sector firms are clustered just below 100 workers, disproportionately so. This adjustment could lead to a move away from permanent workers towards possibly Fixed Term Workers on the same terms and conditions as permanent workers (as we discuss below), especially in the case of small medium-sized formal enterprises, which constitute the majority in India.

2. The Code encourages unitary trade union practices

The Code introduces the concept of a "sole negotiating union" for conducting negotiations with the employer. If there is only one trade union present in an industrial establishment, the employer is obligated to recognize it as the sole negotiating union for the workers. However, when multiple trade unions exist, the trade union that garners the support of at least 51% of the workers on the muster roll, as verified by prescribed methods, will be recognized as the negotiating union by the central or state government. Trade union membership and union density in India's enterprise sector are generally **low** compared to total employment — **over 98% of workers did not belong to any trade union** as of 2010, and collective bargaining coverage was limited. Most enterprises in India, especially small and medium ones, **do not have trade unions at all** — which suggests that the number of firms with even a single union is small.

The implication of that in the presence of one major trade union holding more than 51% percent of a membership share, smaller trade unions may become obsolete, as they will not be recognized by the employer. This means smaller trade unions might find it challenging to grow. Typically, trade unions require time to establish themselves within an organization.

This means that the larger trade union, acting as the sole bargaining agent, may monopolize trade union rights even if it fails to adequately protect workers' rights.

3. The Code imposes stringent regulations on strikes and lockouts:

Strikes or lockouts must be initiated by providing a 14-day notice, and they should commence "within 60 days" from the date of notice. Strikes or lockouts are prohibited "during" the pendency of conciliation proceedings, which occur before a conciliation officer and continue through proceedings in the tribunal. Strikes or lockouts are also prohibited "during" the pendency of arbitration or when a settlement or award is in operation. The Code prescribes severe penalties for violations, including fines of up to Rs 10,000 and imprisonment for up to one month.

In such a regulatory context, legal strikes become exceedingly challenging to execute. The obligation to provide notice triggers State intervention, and once the State intervenes, a strike may become legally infeasible. These stringent provisions significantly limit the ability of workers and employers to engage in strikes and lockouts.

4. The Code legalizes fixed-term employment (FTE)

This move could lead to a shift away from permanent employment. Under FTE, workers are employed based on written contracts for a fixed period. This provision extends beyond the textile and garment sector, where it was previously applicable.

The positive aspect of this provision is that it formalizes existing employment practices, clarifying the terms of employment and ensuring that FTE workers receive wages, allowances, and benefits at least equivalent to those of permanent employees performing similar work. FTE workers are also entitled to statutory benefits in proportion to their length of service, even if they do not meet the qualifying period required for permanent employees. This legal validation provides job security during the employment period and access to various benefits, including social security. This makes FTE similar to permanent employment.

However, there is a downside to this provision. It could contribute to the erosion of regular employment, which has been on the decline in India, both in the formal and informal sectors. The labour market in India has exhibited inherent flexibility, leading to increased informalization of the workforce over the past three decades. The share of contract labour has risen steadily, with contract workers in organized manufacturing increasing from 12 percent in 1990-91 to 33.6 percent in 2013-14. The share of contract workers' wages as a proportion of the total wage has also increased significantly. Consequently, more than 90 percent of the workforce is engaged in the informal sector. The introduction of FTE may further accelerate this trend, potentially diminishing the concept of regular employment.

5. This Code makes standing orders optional in the majority of cases

The Code on Industrial Relations mandates that all industrial establishments with a workforce of at least 300 employees must prepare standing orders covering various employment-related matters listed in a Schedule to the Code. The central government will provide model standing orders on these matters, and industrial establishments are required to base their standing orders on these models.

This provision represents a significant change by increasing the threshold from 100 to 300 workers. In establishments with up to 299 workers, if certified standing orders are not in place, it could have implications for the terms and conditions of employment for those workers. This change may impact the rights and protections afforded to employees in smaller establishments where certified standing orders were previously required for establishments with at least 100 workers.

Code on Wages 2019

1. **Floor Wage:** The Code on Wages 2019 outlines the concept of a floor wage, which the central government will establish by considering the living standards of workers. This floor wage may vary for different geographical areas. Before setting the floor wage, the central government may seek advice from the Central Advisory Board and consult with state governments. The minimum wages determined by central or state governments must be higher than the floor wage, and they cannot reduce existing minimum wages if they are already higher.

However, the Rules do not provide a clear rationale for the floor wage or specify how it differs from the minimum wage. Clarifications are needed to define the distinctions between floor wage and minimum wage, as well as to provide a clear understanding of the purpose and criteria for establishing the floor wage.

2. **Fixing minimum wage:** Minimum wage is a dynamic concept. But there must be a provision for revising the 'basic' component of minimum wage also. This aspect is missing in the Rule. A new section should be introduced to provide the mechanism to redefine the 'basic' part based on the periodic survey on family budget expenditure. Consumption pattern changes over time. Certain products lose their relevance whereas certain new products come into existence. The consumption basket should change accordingly. A family budget expenditure survey should happen every 5 years and 'basic' must be revised accordingly. Otherwise, minimum wage revision through periodic DA adjustments will not suffice to maintain sustainability over time.
3. **Inspectors-cum-facilitators:** The Code introduces the concept of inspectors-cum-facilitators and outlines their responsibilities and authority. These officials are tasked with a dual role: offering compliance guidance to both employers and employees and conducting inspections. Furthermore, the Code permits the relevant government to establish an inspection scheme, which may incorporate web-based inspection procedures. Within this inspection framework, the typical inspection schedule for each inspector-cum-facilitator is designed to be determined through randomization in regular situations. However, the proposed arrangements make certain assumptions that run

contrary to the principles of labour inspection norms set forth by the International Labour Organization (ILO), particularly those outlined in Convention 81. Ideally, inspectors/facilitators should possess the inherent authority to inspect any establishment if they deem it necessary, and the inspection mechanism should not be weakened under any circumstances.

In any case, the number of inspectors for labour in India is way below any ILO norm, and practically meaningless. Having one inspector for over 20 000 workers becomes practically infructuous. In any case, labour inspectors hardly cover the unorganized segment of any sector of the economy in any case. When inspectors *can* cover unorganised units Labour inspectors may intervene if: a law explicitly applies regardless of size or registration (e.g., Minimum Wages Act); a complaint is filed; the establishment crosses employment thresholds; the activity is covered by a specific law. Examples include Small workshops; Roadside eateries; Home-based units; small contractors; and Domestic work (to a limited extent, depending on state rules.

4. Concerns Regarding Calorie Calculation: The determination of minimum wages hinges significantly on the calorie requirement. In the Code on Wages 2019, the specified energy requirement is set at 2700 K calories. According to the convention, the standard working-class family comprises a spouse and two children in addition to the earning worker, totalling three adult consumption units. However, standard working-class families should be equivalent to 3.5 consumption units, not just 3. The current calculation is based on the values of $1+.8+.6+.6=3$. It should be revised to $1+1+.75+.75=3.5$ to eliminate gender discrimination, as reflected in the lower consumption rate (.8 instead of 1) assigned to the female adult member of the family. Additionally, the calorie requirement for children should be increased to at least .75, as children need greater caloric intake during their growth and development stages.
5. The relative importance of non-food items: Existing practice is that non-food consumption is taken as a dependent on food expenditure. Food consumption is given paramount importance in the consumption basket and non-food consumption is taken as a residual and derivative. Non-food consumption is taken as 25 per cent of food consumption. However, the consumption pattern has undergone significant changes over the years and non-food items are presently important in their own rights and no longer are derivative demand. Quantum of non-food items should be determined independently. With the increase in income, the importance of non-food items has increased.
6. Spread over and urban-rural categorization: Code on Wages Rules 2019 proposes that the number of hours of work that shall constitute a normal working day inclusive of a period of rest should not exceed twelve hours. If this is implemented, there is a possibility that certain employers would take advantage of such an expanded window and reduce three shifts to two shifts. Given the exploitative nature of Indian employers and labour market imbalances where supply far exceeds demand, hours of work including spread-over should not exceed more than ten and half hours. Twelve hours will detain the workers unnecessarily and provide scope for rampant misuse. Already in a number of instances, three shifts have been converted into two shifts for all practical purposes.

The Code on Wages Rules 2019 suggests that the Central government shall divide the concerned geographical area into three categories that say metropolitan, non-metropolitan and rural. So far, the practice has to divide regions into categories rural and urban. Dividing urban areas into subcategories metropolitan and non-metropolitan should be avoided. It will unnecessarily complicate the scenario. Other data and information are collected based on urban-rural classification only.

Social Security Code 2020

The Social Security Code 2020 consolidates existing legislation without explicitly incorporating the universalization of social security as a legislative right. While there are hints at this concept, the Code only touches on it tangentially and doesn't fully embrace the idea. For instance, the proposed definition of a 'factory' in the Code still retains the threshold limits of 10 workers with regard to provident funds, health, maternity benefits and gratuity. Many factories in the small and medium-sized enterprise (SME) category employ fewer than 10 permanent workers. This means that unorganized sector workers, particularly those in smaller enterprises, still fall outside the scope of social security provisions.

The Social Security Code missed an opportunity to use social security provisions as a means to formalize the workforce. One of the authors has already spelt out how universal social security can be provided to the majority of workers within 10 years (see Mehrotra, S. (2024). Can India universalize social insurance before its demographic dividend ends? *Journal of the Asia Pacific Economy*, 29(1), 134–153. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13547860.2023.2264645>, also see (Mehrotra, S 2022 'Can India universalize social insurance before its demographic dividend ends? The principles and architecture for universalizing social security by 2030' Bath Papers in International Development and Wellbeing, no. 67, Centre for Development Studies). It's disappointing that the Code doesn't emphasize the role of employers in providing social security to their workers. While the state has a responsibility in this regard, the primary responsibility should still lie with employers, especially considering that they benefit from the productivity of their workers. The state can provide the basic framework, but labour market relations should be encouraged at the micro level. Unfortunately, the Code doesn't delve into these aspects.

In the end, the Social Security Code remained a compilation of existing legislation without a cohesive integration. While it hinted at progress, it fell short of meeting the expectations it had raised. For instance, the provision of maternity benefits only applies to women employed in establishments with ten or more workers, which effectively excludes a large number of women workers in the informal sector. This exclusion goes against the principles outlined in the ILO Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952 (No. 102), which prioritizes the universalization of social security entitlements. Unfortunately, the Social Security Code did not do enough to achieve this objective, and India has not yet ratified Convention 102.

Occupational Safety Health Working Conditions Code 2020

The Code covers establishments with 10 or more workers. It excludes establishments with less than 10 workers. This raises the question of whether workers in smaller establishments should be covered by health and safety laws. It has been argued that the application of labour laws based on the number of employees is desirable to reduce the compliance burden on infant industries and to promote their economic growth. To promote the growth of smaller establishments, some states have amended their labour laws to increase the threshold of their application. For instance, Rajasthan has increased the threshold of applicability of the Factories Act, of 1948, from 10 workers to 20 workers, and from 20 workers to 40 workers. Note that a similar amendment was proposed in the Factories (Amendment) Bill, 2014, which lapsed with the dissolution of the 16th Lok Sabha. These elements are being brought back in the new proposed Code. Occupational health and safety and working conditions of the basic minimum standard are something which should be universally provided to all workers irrespective of their numbers in any particular establishment. This is also mandatory under the ILO Occupational Safety and Health Convention, 1981 (No. 155). However, India is yet to ratify this Convention.

The Code introduces provisions related to welfare facilities, health and safety standards, and work hours for workers, but it does not specify these standards. Instead, it grants the appropriate government the authority to notify them. The existing Acts that the Code subsumes, such as those governing factories, mines, and beedi workers, already specify certain standards. For instance, these Acts prescribe maximum work hours of 9 hours per day and 48 hours per week, along with provisions for amenities like drinking water, washrooms, and first aid facilities.

The question arises as to whether the Code should explicitly outline minimum requirements for these matters, such as work hours, safety standards, and working conditions (e.g., provisions for washrooms and drinking water), rather than leaving them for subsequent government notifications. This raises a debate about whether the Code should provide a comprehensive framework for these aspects or continue with the current approach of delegating authority to the government to define and update such standards as needed.

Conclusions

Formulation of labour codes provided an opportunity to address fundamental issues in the Indian labour market. However, the Codes, have notable shortcomings in various aspects. These include ensuring minimum job security, facilitating trade union participation in collective bargaining, determining minimum wages, addressing gender discrimination in calorie entitlement, and achieving universalization of social security and occupational safety and health.

To make the Codes more balanced, robust, and aligned with the current labour market realities in India and globally, further deliberations and fine-tuning are required. In their current forms, the Codes fall significantly short of meeting these aspirations.

Santosh Mehrotra was Prof of Economics, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, and Chaired the Centre for Labour. He is also Research Fellow, IZA Institute of Labour Economics. Kingshuk Sarkar is Prof of Economics, Goa Institute of Management;