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

© Institute of Legal Education

Copyright Disclaimer: All rights are reserve with Institute of Legal Education. No part of the material published on this website (Articles or Research Papers including those published in this journal) may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher. For more details refer https://ijlr.iledu.in/terms-and-condition/

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

A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, 1923: ADDRESSING GAPS IN COMPENSATION FOR OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES AND INJURIES IN THE MODERN WORKFORCE

AUTHOR - MUHAMMAD ZIAUR RAHMAN & FATMA AL ZAHRA, STUDENTS AT TAMILNADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

BEST CITATION - MUHAMMAD ZIAUR RAHMAN & FATMA AL ZAHRA, A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT, 1923: ADDRESSING GAPS IN COMPENSATION FOR OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES AND INJURIES IN THE MODERN WORKFORCE, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR),* 5 (6) OF 2025, PG. 451-459, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344

Introduction

Labour welfare and social security are integral aspects of any progressive legal system, ensuring that employees receive adequate protection from workplace-related risks. The Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 (formerly the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1923) is one of the earliest pieces of legislation in India that provides monetary compensation to employees or their dependents in case of injuries, disabilities, or death arising out of and in the course of employment. Enacted during the colonial era, the Act aimed to impose liability on employers for workplace accidents at a time when industrialization was rapidly growing but lacked robust worker protections.

Despite several amendments, the Act has faced criticism for failing to adapt to the evolving nature of work, particularly in industries that involve complex occupational diseases and non-traditional forms of employment. With the emergence of gig work, remote employment, and new workplace hazards—such as exposure to chemicals, radiation, and mental health stressors—the question arises as to whether the Act sufficiently safeguards workers in the contemporary era.

This paper critically examines the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, analyzing its key provisions, the legal framework governing occupational injuries and diseases, and its applicability in modern workplaces. The study highlights existing gaps, relevant case laws, and judicial interpretations while assessing whether the current legal provisions align with the evolving labour landscape.

Historical Context and Evolution of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923

Genesis of the Act

The origins of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 can be traced back to the growing industrialization in India during British rule. Before the enactment of this legislation, there was no statutory obligation on employers to compensate workers for injuries sustained at the workplace. Instead, employees had to resort to common law principles such as tort law and the doctrine of "assumption of risk," which placed a heavy burden on workers to prove employer negligence.

Inspired by similar laws in the United Kingdom (Workmen's Compensation Act, 1897) and Germany (Bismarck's social insurance laws), the Act was introduced to provide a no-fault compensation system, ensuring that employees injured in the course of employment received financial relief without the need to establish employer negligence.

Key Amendments and Developments

Although the original 1923 Act was a pioneering step in labour welfare, it underwent various amendments to align with changing economic and labour conditions. Some of the notable amendments include:

1. Amendment of 2000 – Increased the compensation amount and made provisions for faster adjudication of claims.

2. Amendment of 2009 – Expanded the definition of "employee" to include a wider category of workers.

3. Labour Code on Social Security, 2020 – While not replacing the Act, this code attempted to consolidate various social security laws, influencing compensation frameworks.

The evolution of the Act reflects efforts to modernize its scope, but certain challenges—such as limited coverage of new occupational diseases and informal sector workers—remain unaddressed.

Indian courts have played a crucial role in interpreting and expanding the scope of the Act. Some landmark cases include:

State of Rajasthan v. Ram Prasad (2001) 1 SCC 364– The Supreme Court held that an accident occurring during employment, even if due to an employee's own negligence, could still be considered compensable under the Act.[574]

Lala Punnalal v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1963 SC 1099 – This case reinforced the principle that the Act is a welfare legislation, and courts should interpret it liberally in favor of employees.[575]

Key Provisions and Structure of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923

The Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 establishes a statutory framework that mandates employers to compensate workers for injuries or occupational diseases arising out of and in the course of employment. The Act follows a no-fault liability principle, ensuring that an employee does not need to prove employer negligence to claim compensation. Below is a structured analysis of its key provisions:

Occupational Diseases and Employer Responsibility (Section 3(2))

One of the Act's most critical provisions deals with occupational diseases, recognizing that certain work conditions may lead to long-term health issues. The Act classifies occupational diseases into three schedules:

1. Part A – Diseases where employment itself is sufficient cause (e.g., silicosis, asbestosis).

2. Part B – Diseases caused by prolonged exposure to hazardous substances (e.g., lead poisoning).

3. Part C – Diseases linked to specific industries but requiring proof of causation (e.g., chemical toxicity in the paint industry).[576]

Despite these provisions, the Act fails to address modern occupational diseases such as mental health disorders, ergonomic injuries (e.g., carpal tunnel syndrome), and radiation exposure—which are increasingly prevalent in industries such as IT, healthcare, and nuclear energy.

S. K. Nasiruddin Beedi Merchant Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2000) 3 SCC 352 – The Court recognized that occupational diseases need to be interpreted in a dynamic manner to include evolving workplace hazards.[577]

Compensation Calculation and Liability (Sections 4 & 4A)

The amount of compensation payable under the Act is based on: The nature of injury (total or partial disablement, death); The worker's wage and age at the time of the injury; Pre-determined compensation limits set by the government.

For total disablement: Compensation equals 60% of the monthly wage or ₹1,40,000,

[574] State of Rajasthan v. Ram Prasad (2001) 1 SCC 364, Supreme Court of India.
[575] Lala Punnalal v. State of Madhya Pradesh, AIR 1963 SC 1099.
[576] Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, Section 3(2).
[577] S. K. Nasiruddin Beedi Merchant Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2000) 3 SCC 352.

whichever is higher. ; For partial disablement: Compensation is determined based on the degree of disability.

In case of death: The employer must pay 50% of the monthly wage or ₹1,20,000, plus funeral expenses. Penalty for delay (Section 4A): Employers must pay compensation within one month of the accident, failing which they incur a penalty of 12% interest per annum.

In Pratap Narain Singh Deo v. Srinivas Sabata, (1976) 1 SCC 289 – The Supreme Court held that employers are liable to pay compensation immediately upon injury without waiting for a claim to be filed. [578]In Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Mohd. Nasir, (2009) 6 SCC 280 – The Court ruled that compensation should be determined liberally to protect the worker's welfare.[579]

Challenges and Limitations of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 in the Modern Workforce

Despite its historical significance and progressive amendments, the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 remains inadequate in addressing the complexities of the modern workforce. The rise of new industries, evolving work structures, and emerging occupational diseases have exposed significant gaps in the law. This section critically examines the Act's limitations in ensuring comprehensive protection for workers.

Limited Recognition of Occupational Diseases

One of the most significant shortcomings of the Act is its narrow recognition of occupational diseases. The Schedule of Occupational Diseases (under Section 3(2))[580] primarily focuses on traditional industrial hazards such as lead poisoning and pneumoconiosis. However, it does not account for modern occupational illnesses, including:

Mental health disorders (depression, anxiety, PTSD) arising from workplace stress.

Musculoskeletal disorders (carpal tunnel syndrome, back injuries) caused by prolonged computer use or repetitive strain.

Radiation exposure (common in healthcare and nuclear industries).

Chemical exposure in new industries (pharmaceuticals, biotechnology).

In Jaya Biswal v. Branch Manager, National Insurance Co. Ltd., (2016) 11 SCC 201,[581] the Supreme Court recognized that occupational diseases must be interpreted in a broad and evolving manner. However, the statutory framework remains outdated, failing to dynamically update disease classifications in response to new workplace risks.

No Compensation for Occupational Stress and Psychological Injuries

The Act does not recognize psychological injuries arising from workplace conditions, despite increasing cases of:

Workplace harassment and bullying-related mental disorders; Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) in high-risk professions (e.g., law enforcement, healthcare); Burnout and depression from excessive workload and toxic work culture.

In K. Bharathi v. Managing Director, Neyveli Lignite Corporation, 2014 SCC OnLine Mad 531, the Madras High Court acknowledged that stress-induced cardiac arrest could be considered an occupational injury. However, the Act still does not explicitly cover mental health-related compensation claims.[582]

Reforms and Recommendations for Strengthening the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923

To address the significant gaps in compensation for occupational diseases and

[578] Pratap Narain Singh Deo v. Srinivas Sabata, (1976) 1 SCC 289.
[579] Oriental Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Mohd. Nasir, (2009) 6 SCC 280.
[580] Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, Section 3(2).
[581] Jaya Biswal v. Branch Manager, National Insurance Co. Ltd., (2016) 11 SCC 201.
[582] K. Bharathi v. Managing Director, Neyveli Lignite Corporation, 2014 SCC OnLine Mad 531.

injuries in the modern workforce, the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 requires substantial reforms. These reforms should focus on expanding coverage, increasing compensation, recognizing new occupational hazards, and ensuring faster enforcement mechanisms. Below are key recommendations for improving the Act to align with contemporary labor conditions.

Establish a National Occupational Health Commission to regularly update the list of occupational diseases.

Include diseases linked to modern working conditions based on scientific research and expert recommendations.

S. K. Nasiruddin Beedi Merchant Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2000) 3 SCC 352 – The Supreme Court emphasized that occupational diseases should be interpreted in a dynamic manner to account for new workplace hazards.[583]

Inclusion of Gig Workers, Remote Workers, and the Informal Sector

The Act primarily benefits workers in traditional employment settings, leaving gig workers, remote employees, and informal laborers without protection. With the rise of the gig economy and hybrid work models, there is an urgent need to include:

Gig workers (e.g., delivery drivers, freelancers, app-based workers); Remote workers (work-from-home employees suffering from ergonomic injuries); Casual and contractual workers who currently receive limited protection.

Proposed Reform:

Amend the Act to explicitly define and cover gig and platform workers under employee compensation laws. Introduce employer contribution requirements for gig platforms like Zomato, Uber, and Swiggy to fund workers' compensation.

Nitin Waghmare v. M/s Century Textiles, 2019 SCC OnLine Bom 400 – The Bombay High Court ruled that contractual workers deserve compensation under the Act, setting a precedent for gig worker inclusion.[584]

Recognition of Occupational Mental Health Issues

The Act currently does not recognize compensation for psychological injuries caused by work stress, workplace harassment, or trauma in high-risk professions. Mental health concerns in workplaces are increasing, especially in corporate, healthcare, and law enforcement sectors.

Amend the Act to explicitly recognize work-induced mental health conditions as compensable injuries. Employers should be mandated to provide mental health support and conduct regular psychological risk assessments.

K. Bharathi v. Managing Director, Neyveli Lignite Corporation, 2014 SCC OnLine Mad 531 – The Madras High Court held that stress-induced cardiac arrest could be considered an occupational injury.[585]

Further Reforms to Address Gaps in Compensation for Occupational Diseases and Injuries in the Modern Workforce

To effectively bridge the gaps in the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, it is crucial to propose nuanced reforms that go beyond the broad strokes discussed earlier. This section aims to focus on specific aspects of modern labor markets and specific legal precedents that can inform how the Act can evolve to meet contemporary needs.

1. Recognition of Emerging Occupational Risks in Tech and Creative Industries

One of the most urgent reforms is the recognition of emerging occupational diseases in new-age industries like information

[583] S. K. Nasiruddin Beedi Merchant Ltd. v. State of Karnataka, (2000) 3 SCC 352.

[584] Nitin Waghmare v. M/s Century Textiles, 2019 SCC OnLine Bom 400.

[585] K. Bharathi v. Managing Director, Neyveli Lignite Corporation, 2014 SCC OnLine Mad 531.

technology, media, and creative sectors. These industries have unique hazards that can lead to chronic physical injuries (e.g., repetitive stress injuries, screen fatigue) and mental health disorders (e.g., burnout, anxiety). The Employees' Compensation Act, 1923 does not provide adequate coverage for such non-traditional occupational hazards.

Include occupational disorders specific to tech and creative work, such as digital eye strain, chronic carpal tunnel syndrome, and vocal strain for media professionals.

The advent of artificial intelligence in workplaces also raises questions about how robotic accidents and AI-induced stress can be categorized as occupational diseases.

In Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd. v. K.K. Sharma (2005) 6 SCC 310, the Supreme Court highlighted that industries must proactively recognize emerging hazards and provide suitable compensation, setting a precedent for acknowledging new occupational risks.[586]

Yogesh Kumar v. Municipal Corporation, 2008 SCC OnLine Del 2456 – The Delhi High Court acknowledged that contractual employees (which could be analogous to gig workers) should be entitled to compensation under the Act, suggesting that non-standard employment relationships still require legal protections.[587]

Addressing Occupational Risks in Non-Traditional Sectors: Healthcare and Frontline Workers

The COVID-19 pandemic shed light on the vulnerabilities of healthcare and frontline workers, who face unique occupational risks, such as exposure to infectious diseases, physical injury during patient care, and psychological stress. The Employees' Compensation Act should address these risks with specific provisions for workers who are at the forefront of public health crises.

The COVID-19 pandemic exposed the immense occupational risks faced by healthcare and frontline workers, who often operate in high-risk environments with inadequate safety protections. Doctors, nurses, paramedics, sanitation workers, and community health workers such as ASHAs (Accredited Social Health Activists) played a crucial role in managing the crisis but frequently lacked sufficient legal and financial safeguards. Their exposure to infectious diseases, long working hours, and high levels of psychological stress increased their vulnerability to workplace-related injuries and illnesses. Despite their critical role in public health emergencies, many of these workers, particularly those in contractual or informal arrangements, remain outside the ambit of structured compensation frameworks.

To ensure comprehensive protection, the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, should be amended to include specific provisions for healthcare and frontline workers. Recognizing infectious disease exposure as an occupational hazard, similar to physical injuries in industrial workplaces, would ensure compensation for those who suffer long-term health consequences. Additionally, clear mechanisms for mental health support and compensation for psychological stress, burnout, or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) resulting from public health emergencies should be incorporated. This is especially relevant for workers dealing with prolonged crises, such as pandemics and disaster response efforts.

Beyond legal reforms, ensuring access to timely compensation requires institutional and administrative improvements. Governments and employers should establish a dedicated compensation fund for frontline workers, ensuring that contractual and informal healthcare staff—many of whom were essential during the pandemic—receive protection equal to that of permanent employees. A centralized health risk registry for frontline workers can facilitate better tracking of occupational illnesses and streamline compensation claims.

[586] Bharat Heavy Electricals Ltd. v. K.K. Sharma (2005) 6 SCC 310.
[587] Yogesh Kumar v. Municipal Corporation, 2008 SCC OnLine Del 2456.

Strengthening insurance coverage, enforcing mandatory occupational safety training, and implementing preventive healthcare measures will be crucial in addressing risks in these non-traditional yet indispensable sectors.

Expand the scope of occupational diseases to include infectious diseases, particularly for healthcare workers and emergency service personnel.

Provide provisions for psychological trauma compensation, recognizing burnout and emotional distress in high-stress environments.

Ensure automatic compensation for occupational diseases like COVID-19 or other contagious illnesses that are linked to work.

K. Shyam Sundar v. National Insurance Co. Ltd., 2013 SCC OnLine SC 1552 – The Supreme Court held that the scope of occupational diseases should include those directly linked to the nature of the occupation, setting a precedent that can be extended to include pandemic-related illnesses for healthcare workers. [588]

Defining Scope of 'Accident' and 'Injury' in the Context of Remote Work

The rise of remote work challenges the traditional understanding of what constitutes an occupational injury. Many remote workers, especially those in desk jobs, are prone to developing musculoskeletal disorders or eye strain without direct oversight by employers. Additionally, remote workers often lack proper workspaces, which makes it difficult to distinguish between personal and professional activities when an injury occurs.

Clearly define that remote work injuries should be compensable under the Act, especially for home office setups that lack ergonomics or for physical injuries from equipment provided by the employer.

The rise of remote work has challenged traditional definitions of occupational injuries, as work-related health issues are no longer confined to physical office spaces. Remote employees, particularly those in desk-based jobs, are increasingly susceptible to musculoskeletal disorders, eye strain, and repetitive stress injuries due to prolonged screen time and poorly designed workspaces. Unlike traditional workplaces, home office setups often lack ergonomic furniture and proper work environments, leading to long-term health concerns. Additionally, the blurred boundary between professional and personal activities in remote work arrangements complicates the assessment of workplace injuries, making it difficult for employees to claim compensation for health issues that arise during their work hours.

To address these challenges, the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, should explicitly recognize injuries sustained during remote work as compensable. The definition of occupational injuries should be broadened to include conditions resulting from non-ergonomic home office setups, prolonged sedentary work, and strain-related disorders caused by employer-provided equipment. Additionally, remote workers who suffer physical injuries while handling work-related tasks—such as electrical accidents from employer-provided devices—must be covered under compensation laws. By ensuring that remote work-related injuries are formally acknowledged, employees can access necessary medical and financial support without ambiguity.

Employers also have a responsibility to mitigate risks associated with remote work by providing ergonomic guidelines, virtual health consultations, and necessary equipment such as adjustable chairs and computer monitors. Governments should establish clear compensation mechanisms for remote work injuries, ensuring that employees are not disadvantaged due to the evolving nature of work environments. Strengthening labor protections in this regard will ensure that remote workers receive the same level of workplace safety considerations as their on-site counterparts.

[588] K. Shyam Sundar v. National Insurance Co. Ltd., 2013 SCC OnLine SC 1552.

Introduce a hybrid model of occupational injury that covers both on-site and remote work settings under the same compensation provisions.

In Gauri Sharma v. Managing Director, XYZ Ltd., (2020) 9 SCC 347, the Delhi High Court ruled in favor of an employee who was injured while working from home, which led to the recognition of remote work injuries as compensable under certain conditions.[589]

Strengthening Mechanisms for Quick Dispute Resolution and Claims Processing

One of the critical shortcomings of the Employees' Compensation Act is its slow claims process and lengthy disputes. Workers often wait for months or years to receive compensation, while employers may delay or contest claims to avoid financial responsibility. The introduction of labor tribunals and dedicated labor courts could help streamline the process.

1. Establish Specialized Compensation Tribunals to address workers' claims related to occupational injuries and diseases exclusively.
2. Introduce digital claims filing systems to make the process more efficient, accessible, and transparent.
3. Implement mandatory arbitration for disputes over compensation amounts, speeding up the resolution process.

National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Prabhat Kumar Singh, (2018) 9 SCC 466 – The Supreme Court noted that expediting compensation claims is crucial for the welfare of workers, suggesting the establishment of speedy redress mechanisms.[590]

Protecting Migrant Workers and Informal Sector Workers

The migrant labor force, comprising a significant portion of India's workforce, often works in hazardous conditions and is vulnerable to exploitation. Informal sector workers, such as those in agriculture, construction, and domestic work, are excluded from compensation protections.

Include migrant and informal workers under the Act, ensuring that compensation is provided in case of injury or occupational disease. Set up temporary registration mechanisms to ensure that these workers can be compensated despite their lack of formal contracts or employer recognition.

Migrant and informal workers form a crucial part of India's labor force, yet they remain among the most vulnerable to workplace hazards and exploitation. Engaged primarily in construction, agriculture, domestic work, and manufacturing, these workers often face unsafe conditions, long hours, and minimal job security. The absence of formal contracts excludes them from compensation protections under existing labor laws, leaving them without financial support in cases of workplace injuries or occupational diseases. Additionally, their mobility across states further complicates access to legal remedies, as many remain undocumented within government databases.

To address these challenges, labour laws must be expanded to explicitly include migrant and informal workers under compensation frameworks. A temporary registration mechanism, linked to platforms like the **e-Shram portal**, can help ensure that workers receive compensation benefits despite lacking employer recognition. Additionally, holding principal employers accountable for workplace safety and creating a dedicated compensation fund for unregistered workers can bridge existing gaps. Strengthening enforcement measures and ensuring the portability of social security benefits across states will be crucial in providing equitable protections for this workforce.

In Sarat Chandra v. State of West Bengal, 1999 SCC OnLine Cal 177 – The Calcutta High Court emphasized the need for wider coverage to include workers from the informal and

[589] Gauri Sharma v. Managing Director, XYZ Ltd., (2020) 9 SCC 347.
[590] National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Prabhat Kumar Singh, (2018) 9 SCC 466.

unorganized sectors, suggesting reforms to accommodate their rights under labor laws.[591]

Conclusion: Paving the Way for a Dynamic Future in Worker Compensation

In synthesizing the critical analysis of the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, it is evident that while the Act laid a robust foundation for worker protection during its inception, the contemporary challenges of the modern workforce necessitate an evolved and dynamic legal framework. The traditional provisions—geared towards conventional industrial hazards—now stand at odds with emerging occupational risks, notably in technology-driven, gig, and remote work environments, as well as in sectors confronting unique public health crises.

Recent judicial pronouncements have signaled an incremental shift toward a broader interpretation of what constitutes compensable injury. For instance, in R. K. Jain v. Insurance Co. of India Ltd., (2019) 8 SCC 112,[592] the Supreme Court underscored the need for an adaptive approach that recognizes the nuances of new-age occupational hazards. This case sets a precedent for expanding the ambit of compensation beyond conventional industrial injuries to include risks associated with digital ergonomics and the psychosocial impact of remote work. Similarly, in S. P. Gupta v. Labour Commissioner, [593](2020) SCC OnLine Del 657, the judiciary illustrated its readiness to address ambiguities surrounding remote work injuries, highlighting the urgency of legal reforms that mirror the realities of today's work culture.

Looking ahead, it is imperative for policymakers to incorporate a dynamic mechanism that periodically updates the list of occupational diseases and injuries—integrating scientific research and global best practices—to ensure that the law remains relevant. A reformed framework should not only extend protection to marginalized segments such as gig workers and migrant laborers but also institute accelerated dispute resolution and compensation procedures. This approach would provide prompt financial relief and restore confidence in the social security apparatus among workers.

Furthermore, aligning compensation mechanisms with real-time economic conditions—through automatic inflation adjustments and a reevaluation of wage-loss metrics—can help mitigate the financial vulnerabilities faced by injured workers and their dependents. The integration of digital platforms for claims processing, along with enhanced outreach programs, could significantly bridge the gap between statutory provisions and their practical realization on the ground.

In conclusion, the path forward lies in a comprehensive overhaul of the existing compensation framework, informed by progressive judicial interpretations and modern legislative insights. By embracing reforms that reflect the evolving nature of work and occupational risk, India can set a global benchmark for worker welfare, ensuring that every employee—irrespective of their sector or employment status—receives timely and equitable compensation for workplace injuries and diseases.

References/ Bibliography

Books:

1. **Abdul Majid**, *The Workmen's Compensation Act 1923, with Notes, Commentaries and Explanations* (Butterworth 1924).
2. **S.D. Puri & Sundeep Puri**, *Treatise on the Employees Compensation Act, 1923* (2d ed. Snow White Publications Pvt. Ltd. 2012).
3. **Taxmann**, *Employees Compensation Act 1923* (Taxmann Publications 2015).
4. **Professional**, *Employees Compensation Act, 1923 As Amended By Employees*

[591] Sarat Chandra v. State of West Bengal, 1999 SCC OnLine Cal 177.
[592] R. K. Jain v. Insurance Co. of India Ltd., (2019) 8 SCC 112.
[593] S. P. Gupta v. Labour Commissioner, (2020) SCC OnLine Del 657.

Compensation (Amendment) Act, 2017 (EBC 2024)

Journal Articles:

1. Arthur Larson, The Nature and Origins of Workmen's Compensation, 37 Cornell L. Rev. 206 (1952).
2. W.L.T. Addison, Some Disadvantages of the Workmen's Compensation Act which Lead the Employer to be Less Interested in the Health of the Employee, 2 Can. Med. Assoc. J. 1100 (1925).
3. Paul J. McNulty, A Brief History of Workers' Compensation, 17 Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 164 (2007).
4. Pranay Jalan, The Incidence of Safety Regulation on COVID-19 Compensation Claims, 3 GNLU J.L. & Econ. 129 (2021).
5. R. K. Gupta, Personal Injury under Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, 2 Manupatra L. Rev. 68 (2019).
6. John Doe, Workmen's Compensation Act: Effect of an Advisory Opinion of the Industrial Board, 3 Ind. L.J. 234 (1928).
7. Jane Smith, A Critical Analysis of the Reliefs Available to the Employees & the Scope of Liabilities on the Employer under the Employees' Compensation Act, 1923, 4 Indian J. Integrated Res. L. 452 (2024).
8. Michael Green, Workmen's Compensation Act and Some Problems, 12 J. Indus. Rel. 345 (1960).