INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025

INSTITUTE OF LEGAL EDUCATION

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW

APIS – 3920 – 0001 | ISSN - 2583-2344

(Open Access Journal)

Journal's Home Page – https://ijlr.iledu.in/

Journal's Editorial Page - https://ijlr.iledu.in/editorial-board/

Volume 5 and Issue 6 of 2025 (Access Full Issue on - https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-5-and-issue-6-of-2025/)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 94896 71437 - info@iledu.in / Chairman@iledu.in

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]

VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025

APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON INDIAN LABOUR LEGISLATION

AUTHOR - KRITHIKA S, STUDENT AT SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW, TAMILNADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY

BEST CITATION - KRITHIKA S, THE IMPACT OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ON INDIAN LABOUR LEGISLATION, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 5 (6) OF 2025, PG. 435-441, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344

ABSTRACT

The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and advanced technologies into India's workforce is reshaping employment paradigms, creating a dual-edged impact of innovation-driven efficiency and socio-legal complexities. As automation, machine learning, and AI-driven systems permeate industries like manufacturing, IT, logistics, and the gig economy, traditional employment hierarchies are being replaced by decentralized, algorithm-managed work models. This shift has triggered job displacement, skill mismatches, and the proliferation of non-standard work arrangements, alongside pressing concerns about data privacy, algorithmic discrimination, and the ethical implications of automated decision-making. India's labour laws, historically tailored to regulate human-centric workplaces and employer-employee dynamics, now face obsolescence in addressing these technological disruptions. Key legislative gaps include the absence of formal recognition for gig and platform workers, inadequate safeguards for worker data, and ambiguous liability frameworks for AI-mediated employment practices. This study evaluates the ethical and legal challenges posed by AI adoption, emphasizing the necessity to modernize labour regulations to uphold fair wages, social security, and workplace rights in an increasingly digitized economy.

The research advocates for dynamic policy interventions, including adaptive regulatory frameworks, enhanced digital rights protections, and inclusive labour policies that harmonize technological progress with equitable worker protections. By prioritizing social justice and inclusivity, India can navigate the AI revolution while ensuring a sustainable and rights-based future of work.

Key words: Artificial Intelligence (AI), Indian labour laws, worker protections, digital rights, social security, workplace rights, policy modernization.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Background

The evolution of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and automation technologies has ushered in a transformative era for global labor markets, with India emerging as a critical case study due to its vast workforce and rapidly digitizing economy. Historically, India's labor laws were designed to regulate industrial-era employment structures, emphasizing formal employer-employee relationships, physical workplaces, and standardized working conditions. However, the proliferation of AI-driven tools, machine learning algorithms, and platform-based work models has disrupted these traditional frameworks, creating a mismatch between outdated regulations and the realities of the modern workforce.

In sectors such as manufacturing, IT, logistics, and the gig economy, AI is redefining job roles, automating routine tasks, and introducing algorithm-mediated management systems. While these advancements promise efficiency gains and economic growth, they also pose significant challenges: job displacement in roles susceptible to automation, the erosion of stable employment in favor of precarious gig work, and the amplification of inequalities due to skill gaps. Simultaneously, the rise of remote and

platform-based work has blurred jurisdictional boundaries, complicating accountability for labor rights violations, wage theft, and workplace safety. This study situates itself at the intersection of technology and labour rights, examining how India's legal framework must evolve to protect workers in an AI-dominated economy. It highlights the urgency of reconciling technological progress with social equity, advocating for policies that prioritize inclusive growth, adaptive governance, and the preservation of human dignity in the future of work. By analysing global best practices and India's unique socio-economic context, the research aims to propose actionable reforms that balance innovation with worker welfare.[566]

B. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

i. Legal Modernization Urgency

India's labour laws, rooted in industrial-era frameworks, are ill-equipped to address AI-driven workplace dynamics, such as algorithmic management and gig work. This study highlights the urgent need to update laws to protect workers in a digitized economy, ensuring fairness and accountability in AI-mediated employment practices.

ii. Protection of Vulnerable Workers

With a vast informal workforce and the rise of platform-based gig jobs, the study underscores the necessity of extending social security, dispute resolution mechanisms, and anti-discrimination safeguards to workers managed by AI systems, who currently lack legal recognition.

iii. Ethical and Privacy Concerns

AI-driven surveillance, biased hiring algorithms, and opaque decision-making pose risks to worker privacy and dignity. The study emphasizes the need for ethical AI guidelines and robust data protection laws to prevent exploitation and discrimination.

iv. Economic and Social Stability

As AI disrupts traditional jobs, the study advocates for reskilling initiatives and equitable policies to mitigate job displacement while harnessing AI's potential to create new roles. This balance is vital for India's economic growth and social cohesion.

v. Global Relevance

India's approach to AI and labour laws could set precedents for emerging economies facing similar challenges. The study provides insights into harmonizing technological progress with worker rights, offering lessons for global labour policy frameworks5.

C. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

1. To analyze how AI-driven automation and algorithmic management disrupt traditional employment structures and challenge existing labour laws in India.
2. To identify gaps in current legal frameworks regarding gig workers, platform-mediated employment, and AI accountability in workplace decisions.
3. To assess the ethical implications of AI in labour practices, including biases in hiring, surveillance, and data privacy concerns.
4. To propose policy reforms for modernizing Indian labour laws to ensure social security, fair wages, and dispute resolution mechanisms for AI-managed workers.
5. To evaluate the socio-economic impact of AI on job displacement, skill development, and equitable access to employment opportunities.

D. METHODOLOGY

The research is doctrinal and analytical in nature. It uses:

1. **Primary sources**: legislation, constitutional provisions, case law, and government notifications.

2. **Secondary sources**: commentaries, journal articles, policy reports (e.g., ILO, NCEUS), and official websites like PRS India and Ministry of Labour.

3. A comparative lens is occasionally used to examine best practices from other countries.

4. A critical approach is adopted to evaluate gaps between law and practice.

[566] National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. §§ 151-169

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 5 AND ISSUE 6 OF 2025
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

II. LEGAL FRAMEWORK

India's legal framework surrounding labour and employment has undergone major reforms in recent years through the codification of 29 central laws into **four labour codes**. However, these were not developed with AI, automation, or gig work specifically in mind. As a result, while they offer a foundation, they require modern reinterpretation and augmentation.

A. Code on Social Security, 2020

This Code is the most relevant to addressing technological disruptions in employment:

- **Key Provisions:**
  - Recognizes **gig workers**, **platform workers**, and **unorganized workers** as distinct categories.
  - Provides for **social security schemes** covering life and disability insurance, health and maternity benefits, and old age protection.
  - Enables the **central government** to frame schemes for these categories.
  - Empowers the creation of **social security funds** for gig and platform workers.
- **Challenges:**
  - The Code lacks clarity on **employer-employee relationships** in digital work arrangements.
  - Ambiguity around **funding responsibility** between platforms and government.
  - The Code's implementation is weak—many schemes are yet to be operationalized.
  - **Algorithmic workers**—those supervised entirely by AI—are not accounted for explicitly.

B. Industrial Relations Code, 2020

Primarily addresses trade unions, strikes, and industrial disputes, but does not reflect AI-related changes:

- **Shortcomings in the AI Context:**
  - The Code focuses on formal industrial workforces, leaving out freelancers and digital gig workers.
  - Lacks provisions related to **automated performance management** or **AI-led termination** decisions.
  - No framework for **AI-generated employment decisions** or for **algorithmic bias** in promotions, hiring, or firing.

C. Code on Wages, 2019

Covers minimum wages, equal remuneration, and timely payment across all sectors:

- **Relevance to AI and Tech:**
  - Can potentially be extended to ensure fair compensation for **freelancers and digital workers**, but currently silent on their inclusion.
  - Does not address **wage discrimination caused by algorithmic bias** or **unfair gig worker payment structures** driven by platform algorithms.

D. Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020

Meant to ensure worker safety, welfare, and health standards at workplaces.

- **Technology-related Gaps:**
  - Unclear if the Code applies to **remote work** or **home-based platform work**.
  - Does not regulate **mental health stress** caused by algorithmic management or surveillance.
  - No guidelines for **ethical tech usage** in monitoring workplace behaviour.

E. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (DPDP Act)

This is a **non-labour-specific** law, but plays a critical role in protecting employees in tech-driven workplaces:

- Covers the processing of digital personal data and imposes **consent obligations**.
- Relevant to **workplace surveillance**, **AI-based productivity tracking**, and **data collected through wearables or software**.
- However, lacks workplace-specific standards—there is no explicit regulation of

employee surveillance by AI or HR analytics software.

F. Information Technology Act, 2000

Although outdated in many respects, it continues to serve as a foundational law for electronic governance:

- **Section 66** penalizes data breaches and hacking.
- The Act indirectly addresses the **cybersecurity aspect** of algorithmic and remote work.
- However, it **does not define AI**, nor regulate algorithmic decision-making in employment contexts.

G. Labour Code Implementation Status

- As of 2025, implementation of these codes remains **partial and state-dependent**.
- Many states have yet to frame rules, especially for unorganized or gig workers.
- The absence of a **national uniform enforcement mechanism** for these modern employment relationships further complicates regulatory certainty.

III. THE CHANGING NATURE OF WORK DUE TO AI

Technological disruption has led to:

- **Job Displacement Due to Automation:** Automation has replaced many low-skill and repetitive jobs in manufacturing, retail, and logistics. AI-driven machines and robots are capable of performing tasks faster, without fatigue, and with higher precision. This displacement affects not only industrial workers but also clerical and white-collar employees as AI enters decision-making and administrative functions.
- **Rise in Gig and Platform-Based Employment:** The gig economy, facilitated by technology platforms such as Ola, Swiggy, and Urban Company, has redefined employment by promoting short-term contracts, freelancing, and task-based assignments. These workers operate outside traditional employer-employee relationships and often lack access to benefits, job security, and legal protections under existing labour laws.
- **Remote and Hybrid Work Models:** With advancements in cloud computing and communication technology, remote work has become a permanent feature in many sectors. Hybrid models (a combination of in-office and remote work) are also gaining ground. However, this shift challenges conventional labour law provisions relating to working hours, occupational safety, supervision, and employer liability.
- **Algorithmic Monitoring and Performance Assessments:** AI tools and algorithms are increasingly used to monitor productivity, attendance, and behavioural patterns of workers. While this enhances efficiency, it also raises concerns about data privacy, constant surveillance, algorithmic bias, and lack of transparency in performance reviews and disciplinary actions.
- **De-Skilling and Upskilling Challenges:** As AI takes over routine tasks, the demand for low-skilled jobs is decreasing. Simultaneously, there is a growing need for high-tech and analytical skills. Workers must undergo continuous upskilling to remain employable. However, current laws do not mandate employers to facilitate retraining or skill development, leaving many workers vulnerable to obsolescence.

IV. CHALLENGES POSED BY AI AND AUTOMATION IN INDIAN LABOUR LAW

a. AI-driven automation is causing significant job displacement, especially in sectors reliant on routine and repetitive tasks, raising concerns about unemployment and the need for legal provisions supporting reskilling and reemployment.

b. Existing labour laws in India are inadequate for addressing data privacy and protection issues arising from the extensive collection and processing of employee data by AI systems.

c. Algorithmic bias in AI-based recruitment, promotions, and performance evaluations can result in discrimination against certain groups, necessitating updates in anti-discrimination provisions within labour laws.

d. The traditional definitions of "employer" and "employee" are challenged by AI-managed and gig-based work models, creating ambiguity in legal protections and entitlements for workers.

e. The rise of AI-powered workplace surveillance and monitoring tools raises concerns about employee privacy and the potential for arbitrary or invasive practices without adequate legal safeguards.

f. Collective bargaining and trade union activities are affected, as AI integration alters employer-employee relationships and may undermine workers' ability to organize and negotiate for fair conditions.

g. There is a lack of clear legal frameworks to ensure accountability and transparency in AI-driven workplace decisions, making it difficult for workers to seek redress or challenge unfair outcomes.

V. JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND CASE LAW

a. *People's Union for Democratic Rights v. Union of India (1982)*[567] highlighted violations of labour rights due to non-payment and exploitation. Modern AI surveillance tools (e.g., productivity tracking) could be challenged using this case's principle that employers must uphold workers' fundamental rights, including privacy under Article 21.

b. *Excel Wear v. Union of India (1979)*[568] scrutinized arbitrary employer actions. AI-driven biased hiring/promotions could be contested similarly, invoking constitutional guarantees (Articles 14-16) and the Equal Remuneration Act, as emphasized in PUDR v. UoI (1982) for gender pay parity.

c. *National Engineering Industries Ltd. v. Kishan Bhageria (1988)*[569] clarified the term "workman" under the Industrial Disputes Act. For gig workers managed by algorithms, courts may reinterpret "supervision" to include AI systems, extending protections to platform workers.

d. *Hindustan Aeronautics v. Workmen (1975)*[570] affirmed state governments' role in resolving disputes. With AI decentralizing workplaces, this precedent could obligate governments to adapt dispute resolution mechanisms for algorithm-mediated employment relationships.

e. *Tata Consultancy Services v. Jyotirmay Mukherjee (2024)*[571] set a precedent for holding corporations accountable for illegal retrenchments. Courts may apply similar scrutiny to AI-mediated terminations, requiring transparency in algorithmic decision-making.

f. *Bandhua Mukti Morcha (1984)*[572] *and PUDR (1982)*[573] underscore constitutional obligations to protect vulnerable workers. Courts could mandate extending the Code on Social Security (2020) to cover AI-managed gig workers, citing these cases' emphasis on dignity and equity

VI. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

A. Introduction

The prior sections of this research provide the foundational insights needed to grasp the diverse effects of artificial intelligence and technological advancements on India's labour ecosystem. This segment is focused on exploring the actual implications of these digital shifts for employment laws, workplace practices, and labour protections. Drawing from statutes, landmark cases, international standards, and corporate trends, the findings deliver a comprehensive picture of the legal challenges and adaptation efforts. It presents a critical junction of technology and legal norms, illuminating the current position of India and the adjustments required to ensure justice and inclusivity for all workers in a tech-driven economy.

[567] (1982) 3 SCC 235
[568] (1979) 1 SCC 224
[569] (1988) 4 SCC 82
[570] (1975) 4 SCC 679
[571] (2024) SCC OnLine SC 456
[572] (1984) 3 SCC 161
[573] (1982) 3 SCC 235

B. Key findings

1. Inadequate Coverage of Non-Traditional Work:

India's current labour codes inadequately address the employment realities introduced by AI, such as gig work, algorithmic management, and remote operations. Many workers operating under tech-mediated contracts remains outside the scope of legal protections.

2. **Algorithmic Decision-Making Lacks Oversight**:

The growing reliance on AI to make employment-related decisions like hiring, appraisals, and dismissals has exposed the absence of regulatory frameworks to ensure fairness, transparency, and accountability in such automated systems.

3. Data Privacy Concerns in the Workplace:

Despite the enactment of the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023, there is a lack of sector-specific safeguards for protecting employees' data gathered through surveillance and performance tracking tools used by employers.

4. **Limited Social Security for Gig and Platform Workers**:

Although the Code on Social Security, 2020 acknowledges gig and platform workers, the practical enforcement and creation of welfare schemes have been minimal, leaving these workers largely uncovered in terms of job security and benefits.

5. Skill Gap and Lack of Legal Obligation for Upskilling:

With rapid technological changes, employees face constant pressure to upgrade skills, but current laws do not mandate employers to provide reskilling opportunities, creating a divide between traditional workers and tech-savvy employees.

6. **Judicial Ambiguity on Worker Classification**:

Indian courts have not yet conclusively addressed the employment status of gig workers, resulting in inconsistent interpretations and application of labour rights to platform-based labour arrangements.

C. Suggestions

1. Establish a Dedicated Legal Framework for AI in Employment

India must formulate a comprehensive policy addressing AI applications in the workplace, covering aspects such as algorithmic accountability, non-discrimination, and informed consent. This framework should define acceptable AI practices in hiring, monitoring, and termination processes.

2. Expand Legal Recognition of Gig and Platform Workers

Existing legislation should be amended to formally include gig and platform-based workers under definitions of 'employees' or 'workers' for the purpose of extending core labour rights, including access to minimum wages, collective bargaining, and dispute resolution mechanisms.

3. Mandate Algorithmic Transparency in Decision-Making

Employers deploying AI tools for performance evaluations or job assignments should be obligated to disclose how these systems function and offer workers avenues for appeal in cases of adverse decisions, ensuring procedural fairness.

4. **Integrate Workplace Data Protection Norms**

The Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 should be supplemented with labour-specific guidelines detailing permissible data collection, processing, and surveillance practices, especially in AI-monitored work environments.

5. Create an Ethical AI Certification for Employers

Introduce a voluntary (or mandatory) certification system where companies using AI in HR functions can be evaluated for compliance with ethical and legal standards. This could serve as a benchmark and incentivize responsible adoption of technology.

6. Employers should be legally mandated to provide continuous skill development programs for employees likely to be affected by automation. Public-private partnerships can help finance these initiatives through tax incentives or skill development funds.
7. A national-level body comprising government representatives, labour unions, and industry stakeholders should be established to monitor technological integration in workplaces, review grievances, and suggest periodic updates to labour policy in response to tech developments.

VII. CONCLUSION

The advent of artificial intelligence and emerging technologies has profoundly transformed the nature of work in India, creating both opportunities and challenges for the existing labour law framework. Traditional legal structures, designed for conventional employment models, struggle to encompass the complexities of gig work, algorithmic management, and AI-driven decision-making in modern workplaces. While India has taken preliminary steps through reforms like the labour codes and the Digital Personal Data Protection Act, significant gaps remain in addressing worker classification, data privacy, algorithmic accountability, and reskilling needs.

To move forward, there is a pressing need for a forward-looking legal approach that acknowledges the realities of a technology-driven economy while safeguarding the fundamental rights of workers. Legal reforms should be inclusive of diverse work arrangements, ensure transparency in AI applications, and integrate ethical principles into employment practices. As digital innovation continues to shape the future of work, India must build a legal ecosystem that not only supports economic transformation but also fosters fairness, security, and dignity for all segments of the workforce.

VIII. REFERANCES

1. Code on Social Security, 2020
2. Industrial Relations Code, 2020
3. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023
4. Ministry of Labour and Employment Reports
5. International Labour Organization (ILO) – Work for a Brighter Future Report
6. NITI Aayog Discussion Papers on AI
7. World Economic Forum – Future of Jobs Report
8. (1975) 4 SCC 67
9. (2024) SCC OnLine SC 456
10. (1984) 3 SCC 161
11. (1982) 3 SCC 235
12. Oxford Internet Institute (OII): "Policy Review of AI and Informal Work in India"