



INDIAN JOURNAL OF
LEGAL REVIEW

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 5 OF 2026

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 6 and Issue 5 of 2026 (Access Full Issue on – <https://ijlr.iledu.in/volume-6-and-issue-5-of-2026/>)

Publisher

Prasanna S,

Chairman of Institute of Legal Education

No. 08, Arul Nagar, Seera Thoppu,

Maudhanda Kurichi, Srirangam,

Tiruchirappalli – 620102

Phone : +91 73059 14348 – 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/>

“RETIRAL BENEFITS AS HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA: A CONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISPRUDENTIAL ANALYSIS”

AUTHOR – SRIRAM V M, SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW THE TAMILNADU DR AMBEDKAR LAW UNIVERSITY, CHENNAI

BEST CITATION – SRIRAM V M, “RETIRAL BENEFITS AS HUMAN RIGHTS IN INDIA: A CONSTITUTIONAL AND JURISPRUDENTIAL ANALYSIS”, INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR), 6 (5) OF 2026, PG. 68-72, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN – 2583-2344.

Abstract:

Retiral benefits such as pension, gratuity, provident fund, and family pension constitute the primary source of financial security for individuals in their post-employment phase. While traditionally regarded as statutory or service-related entitlements, Indian jurisprudence has progressively evolved to recognise these benefits as integral to the protection of human dignity and constitutional rights. This paper critically examines the transformation of retiral benefits from deferred wages to enforceable human rights, situating them within the framework of Articles 21 and 300-A of the Constitution of India. It analyses key judicial pronouncements that have redefined pension as a vested right rather than a discretionary bounty, alongside the proactive role of the National Human Rights Commission in highlighting systemic failures in their disbursement. The study further engages with international human rights standards to contextualise India's approach within a global framework of social security. By identifying persistent administrative and structural challenges, the paper argues for a comprehensive rights-based model supported by legislative reform, institutional strengthening, and technological modernization. It concludes that the true realisation of retiral benefits as human rights depends not merely on legal recognition but on effective and timely implementation, ensuring dignity, security, and social justice in the post-retirement phase.

Keywords: Retiral Benefits, Pension, Human Rights, Right to Dignity, Social Security, Deferred Wages, NHRC, Constitutional Law, Judicial Interpretation, Welfare State, Administrative Justice, Post-Retirement Security

Introduction:

Retirement represents not merely the cessation of employment but a fundamental shift in an individual's socio-economic condition. For most employees in India, particularly those in government and organized sectors, retiral benefits constitute the principal source of livelihood after retirement. However, despite the existence of statutory frameworks governing these benefits, a significant number of retirees face delays, denials, and procedural hurdles in accessing what is rightfully theirs.

This issue assumes a deeper constitutional and moral dimension when viewed through the lens of human rights. The denial of retiral benefits is not simply an administrative lapse; it directly affects an individual's dignity, autonomy, and ability to sustain life. Recognising this, the National Human Rights Commission has categorically asserted that retiral benefits must be treated as human rights.³⁷ This reconceptualization marks a decisive shift from a narrow contractual understanding to a broader rights-based framework.

³⁷ National Human Rights Commission, *Retiral Benefits as a Human Right: NHRC Initiatives (2014).

This paper seeks to critically analyse this shift by examining the legal foundations, judicial developments, and institutional interventions that have contributed to the recognition of retiral benefits as an integral component of human rights jurisprudence in India.

Retiral Benefits as Deferred Wages: Theoretical and Legal Understanding

The conceptualisation of retiral benefits as deferred wages provides the foundation for their recognition as enforceable rights. Unlike gratuitous payments, these benefits are earned through continuous service and form part of the overall compensation structure. Employees, during their years of active service, effectively defer a portion of their earnings with the expectation that it will be disbursed upon retirement.

The NHRC has emphasised that retiral benefits represent “hard-earned savings of a lifetime,” the deprivation of which can lead to severe financial distress.³⁸ This understanding aligns with established principles of labour welfare and social security, which recognise the employer’s obligation to ensure post-retirement security.

Statutory enactments such as the Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972 and the Employees’ Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 reinforce this conceptualisation by providing a legal framework for the accrual and disbursement of such benefits.³⁹ These statutes transform the moral obligation of employers into legally enforceable duties, thereby strengthening the rights of employees.

Constitutional Dimensions of Retiral Benefits

The recognition of retiral benefits as human rights finds strong support within the constitutional framework of India. Article 21, which guarantees the right to life and personal liberty, has been expansively interpreted to include the right to live with dignity, the right to

livelihood, and the right to social security.⁴⁰ Retiral benefits are essential to the realization of these rights, as they provide financial stability and ensure access to basic necessities.

Article 300-A further strengthens this position by protecting individuals from arbitrary deprivation of property. Retiral benefits, once accrued, constitute a vested right and cannot be withheld without legal authority.⁴¹ The constitutional protection of property thus reinforces the enforceability of these benefits.

The Directive Principles of State Policy, particularly Articles 38, 39, 41, and 43, further underscore the State’s obligation to promote social justice and provide assistance in cases of old age and unemployment.⁴² Although these provisions are not enforceable in courts, they serve as guiding principles for legislative and judicial action, thereby supporting a rights-based approach to retiral benefits.

Judicial Evolution: From Privilege to Right

The transformation of retiral benefits into enforceable rights has been largely driven by judicial interpretation. In *Deokinandan Prasad v. State of Bihar*, the Supreme Court unequivocally held that pension is not a bounty but a right vested in the employee.⁴³ This decision marked a significant departure from earlier views that treated pension as a discretionary payment.

The landmark judgment in *D.S. Nakara v. Union of India* further expanded this understanding by recognising pension as a measure of socio-economic justice.⁴⁴ The Court emphasized that pension ensures dignity and economic security in old age and cannot be subjected to arbitrary classifications.

In *State of Jharkhand v. Jitendra Kumar Srivastava*, the Supreme Court reaffirmed that pension and gratuity are property rights protected under Article 300-A and cannot be

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972; Employees’ Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952.

⁴⁰ *Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India*, AIR 1978 SC 597.

⁴¹ *State of Jharkhand v. Jitendra Kumar Srivastava*, (2013) 12 SCC 210.

⁴² Constitution of India, Arts. 38, 39, 41, 43

⁴³ *Deokinandan Prasad v. State of Bihar*, AIR 1971 SC 1409.

⁴⁴ *State of Jharkhand v. Jitendra Kumar Srivastava*, (2013) 12 SCC 210.

withheld without statutory authority.⁴⁵ This judgment reinforced the constitutional status of retiral benefits.

More recently, in *Shrawan Kumar Das v. State of Jharkhand*, the High Court emphasized that retiral benefits must be disbursed promptly and that undue delay constitutes a violation of fundamental rights.⁴⁶ These decisions collectively establish a robust jurisprudential framework that recognises retiral benefits as enforceable rights.

International Human Rights Perspective

The recognition of retiral benefits as human rights is consistent with international legal standards. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights recognises the right to social security and an adequate standard of living, including security in old age.⁴⁷ Similarly, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights guarantees the right to social security as a fundamental human right.⁴⁸

The International Labour Organization has also advocated for comprehensive social protection systems, including pension schemes, as essential components of decent work.⁴⁹ These international norms provide a broader framework within which domestic laws can be interpreted, reinforcing the human rights dimension of retiral benefits.

NHRC's Expanding Role in Protecting Retiral Rights

The NHRC has played a crucial role in highlighting the human rights implications of delays in retiral benefits. Established under the Protection of Human Rights Act, 1993, the Commission has the authority to investigate violations and recommend corrective measures.

Through its interventions, the NHRC has addressed numerous cases where retirees and their dependants were deprived of benefits for extended periods. In many instances, delays spanning decades were observed, leading to severe economic and emotional distress. The Commission has consistently held that such delays amount to violations of the right to life and dignity.

Despite its proactive role, the effectiveness of the NHRC is limited by the non-binding nature of its recommendations. Strengthening its enforcement powers could significantly enhance the protection of retiral rights.

Socio-Economic and Psychological Implications

The denial or delay of retiral benefits has profound socio-economic consequences. For many retirees, pension is the sole source of income, and its absence can lead to poverty and dependence. The situation is particularly severe for widows and female dependants, who often lack alternative means of livelihood.

In addition to financial hardship, retirees frequently experience psychological distress due to prolonged uncertainty and bureaucratic obstacles. The inability to access rightful benefits undermines their dignity and sense of security.

These consequences highlight the need to recognise retiral benefits not merely as financial entitlements but as essential components of human well-being.

Structural Challenges and Need for Reform

Despite significant legal advancements, several challenges persist in the implementation of retiral benefits. Administrative inefficiencies, lack of coordination, and outdated record-keeping systems often result in delays. Corruption and lack of accountability further exacerbate the problem.

The absence of a unified legal framework governing retiral benefits leads to inconsistencies and confusion. A

⁴⁵ *State of Jharkhand v. Jitendra Kumar Srivastava*, (2013) 12 SCC 210.

⁴⁶ *Shrawan Kumar Das v. State of Jharkhand*, Jharkhand High Court (2024).

⁴⁷ Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, Arts. 22 & 25.

⁴⁸ International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 1966, Art. 9.

⁴⁹ International Labour Organization, Social Security (Minimum Standards) Convention, 1952.

comprehensive legislative approach could address these issues and ensure uniform protection across sectors.

Technological interventions, such as digitization of pension records and automated processing systems, could significantly improve efficiency and transparency.

Suggestions and Reforms

The recognition of retiral benefits as human rights must be complemented by concrete institutional and legislative reforms to ensure their effective realization. While judicial pronouncements have established the legal status of such benefits, the persistent gap between law and implementation continues to undermine their practical enforcement. Therefore, a comprehensive reform-oriented approach is essential to bridge this divide.

One of the foremost reforms required is the establishment of a uniform and consolidated legal framework governing retiral benefits across sectors. At present, the multiplicity of statutes and administrative rules creates ambiguity and inconsistency, particularly affecting employees who transition between different forms of employment. A unified legislative model would ensure clarity, uniformity, and ease of enforcement.

Further, the introduction of time-bound statutory obligations for the disbursement of retiral benefits is crucial. Delays often arise due to procedural inefficiencies and lack of accountability. Mandating strict timelines, coupled with penal consequences for unjustified delay, would significantly enhance administrative responsibility and deter negligence. In this context, the imposition of interest liability on delayed payments can serve as an effective deterrent against bureaucratic inaction.

Another critical reform lies in the digitisation and automation of pension administration systems. The integration of digital record-keeping, real-time tracking mechanisms, and automated processing can minimize human

intervention, reduce errors, and ensure timely disbursement. Such technological reforms would also enhance transparency and enable retirees to monitor the status of their claims without unnecessary procedural hurdles.

Equally important is the need to strengthen institutional mechanisms, particularly the role of the National Human Rights Commission. While the NHRC has played a significant role in addressing violations, its recommendations remain non-binding. Granting greater enforceability to its decisions, or establishing specialised tribunals for retiral disputes, would ensure quicker and more effective remedies.

Additionally, expanding the scope of retiral benefits to include the informal and unorganised sector is imperative. A large segment of India's workforce remains outside the ambit of formal social security systems, leading to structural inequality in post-retirement security. The development of inclusive pension schemes and contributory social security models can help address this disparity and align India with global human rights standards.

Finally, there is a pressing need for greater awareness and accessibility of legal remedies. Many retirees, particularly in rural areas, remain unaware of their rights or lack the resources to pursue legal action. Strengthening legal aid mechanisms and simplifying grievance redressal processes would empower individuals to assert their rights effectively.

Conclusion

The evolution of retiral benefits from statutory entitlements to constitutionally protected human rights marks a significant milestone in Indian legal jurisprudence. Rooted in the expansive interpretation of Article 21 and reinforced by Article 300-A, this transformation reflects the growing recognition that dignity and security must extend beyond the years of active employment. Judicial pronouncements and the proactive role of the National Human Rights Commission have collectively contributed to

this shift, reaffirming that retiral benefits are integral to the right to life and human dignity.

However, the persistence of administrative delays, structural inefficiencies, and unequal access reveals that legal recognition alone is insufficient. The true realization of retiral benefits as human rights depends on the State's ability to translate constitutional ideals into administrative reality. Without effective enforcement mechanisms, timely disbursement, and inclusive social security policies, the rights of retirees risk remaining theoretical rather than substantive.

Ultimately, the measure of a welfare state lies not merely in acknowledging rights but in ensuring their meaningful enjoyment. The protection of retiral benefits must therefore be viewed as a continuing constitutional obligation—one that demands not only legal affirmation but also institutional commitment, administrative efficiency, and social sensitivity. Only through such a holistic approach can the promise of dignity, security, and justice in retirement be fully realized.

