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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF WORKING CHILDREN IN INDIA: A STUDY OF EXISTING MECHANISM AND CHALLENGES

AUTHOR – SARTHAK SHUKLA* & DR. ROHIT KUMAR SHUKLA**

* STUDENT AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL LUCKNOW, AMITY UNIVERSITY UTTAR PRADESH LUCKNOW CAMPUS

** ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF LAW AT AMITY LAW SCHOOL LUCKNOW, AMITY UNIVERSITY UTTAR PRADESH LUCKNOW CAMPUS

BEST CITATION – SARTHAK SHUKLA & DR. ROHIT KUMAR SHUKLA**,** PROTECTING THE RIGHTS OF WORKING CHILDREN IN INDIA: A STUDY OF EXISTING MECHANISM AND CHALLENGES, *INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW (IJLR)*, 6 (7) OF 2026, PG. 124-139, APIS – 3920 – 0001 & ISSN - 2583-2344.

ABSTRACT

The persistence of child labour in India represents a profound contradiction between the nation's transformative constitutional ethos and its socio-economic realities. Despite the presence of a robust constitutional framework anchored by fundamental rights guaranteeing free and compulsory education (Article 21A) and protection against hazardous employment (Article 24) millions of children remain entangled in exploitative labour practices across the organized and unorganized sectors. This exhaustive research report provides a critical, expert-level analysis of the legal mechanisms, judicial pronouncements, and institutional frameworks designed to protect the rights of working children in India, juxtaposed against the systemic socio-economic challenges that impede their effective implementation.

A central analytical focus of this study is the critical exegesis of the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016. While the amendment seemingly aligns the minimum age of employment with the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act, 2009, its introduction of broad exemptions for "family enterprises" and the drastic reduction in the schedule of hazardous occupations have inadvertently created statutory loopholes that legitimize the exploitation of children in rural and marginalized communities. The research further evaluates the judiciary's proactive role as the guardian of constitutional morality, analyzing landmark pronouncements such as M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu and Bachpan Bachao Andolan v. Union of India. These cases have historically functioned as the vanguard for child rights by mandating rehabilitation funds, comprehensive rescue protocols, and linking child labour directly to human trafficking and bonded labour.

Furthermore, the study rigorously assesses the efficacy of contemporary administrative enforcement mechanisms, notably the Platform for Effective Enforcement for No Child Labour (PENCiL) portal and the integration of the National Child Labour Project (NCLP) into the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan. By examining empirical census data, government audit reports, and successful grassroots intervention models like Kerala's poverty eradication initiatives and the Bal Mitra Gram (BMG) framework, the report uncovers significant enforcement deficits and a severe lack of institutional convergence. The study concludes with targeted legal, administrative, and policy recommendations, advocating for the alignment of domestic legislation with international conventions, the closure of statutory loopholes, and the realization of constitutional morality to ensure the holistic protection, rescue, and rehabilitation of vulnerable children.

Keywords : Child Labour, Constitutional Morality, CLPRA 2016, PENCiL Portal, Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

Introduction and Research Problem

India's demographic dividend is frequently heralded in global economic discourse as the primary engine of its future geopolitical and economic supremacy. The nation boasts a massive youth population, theoretically positioning it for unprecedented industrial and technological growth. Yet, beneath the dominant narrative of a surging global superpower lies the stark, enduring reality of child labour a systemic crisis that deprives millions of children of their fundamental right to childhood, physical health, psychological well-being, and formal education. According to the 2011 National Census of India, approximately 10.12 million children between the ages of 5 and 14 were engaged in various forms of labour, constituting a highly vulnerable, often invisible segment of the national workforce.[1] Worldwide, the International Labour Organization (ILO) estimates that agriculture is the largest employer of child labour, accounting for approximately 60 to 70 percent of working children globally, a statistic that holds profound relevance for India's agrarian-dominated economy.[2] Despite the international community's explicit commitment to eliminating all forms of child labour by 2025 under Target 8.7 of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), the eradication of this practice in India remains a formidable, multi-dimensional challenge.[3]

The legal and normative architecture of child rights in India is, on paper, theoretically robust and comprehensive. The Constitution of India explicitly outlaws forced labour, human trafficking, and the employment of children in hazardous industries, establishing a framework of positive rights that the State is obligated to enforce.[4] Successive legislative enactments, notably the foundational Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act of 1986, the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education (RTE) Act of 2009, and the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act of 2015, were designed to create an impenetrable legal shield around the vulnerable child.[5] However, the empirical reality of enforcement reveals a deeply fractured system. The problem of child labour in India is not merely a legal anomaly; it is a deeply intersectional phenomenon, rooted in chronic intergenerational poverty, caste-based occupational segregation, adult illiteracy, lack of social safety nets, and systemic administrative apathy.[6]

The core research problem addressed in this report arises directly from the dissonance between the normative guarantees of the Indian Constitution and the specific statutory loopholes present in current legislative frameworks. Specifically, the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016, despite its purported aim to impose a blanket ban on child labour below the age of 14, introduced critical legislative exemptions that undermine its primary objective. By permitting children to work in "family enterprises" after school hours and by drastically shrinking the official schedule of hazardous occupations, the law inadvertently accommodates and legalizes the very socio-economic structures that perpetuate child exploitation in the unorganized sector.[7]

Furthermore, post-rescue rehabilitation frameworks suffer from severe structural fragmentation and lack of financial continuity. Institutional mechanisms like the digital PENCiL portal and the transition of the targeted National Child Labour Project (NCLP) into the broader Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan have encountered profound implementation hurdles. These include low employer conviction rates, inadequate financial convergence, and an inability to track rescued children to prevent recidivism.Ministry of Labour & Employment, "361 Complaints of Child Labour Resolved Through Pencil Portal" (2019). Consequently, the research problem necessitates a rigorous, expert-level examination of whether India's legal and institutional mechanisms are genuinely equipped to protect working children, or whether they merely regulate, manage, and render invisible their ongoing exploitation. The

study interrogates the capacity of the State to reconcile its economic policies with the doctrine of constitutional morality, which demands the absolute prioritization of human dignity over economic expediency.

Research Objectives

The primary aim of this exhaustive study is to dissect the legal, administrative, and judicial frameworks governing child labour in India. To achieve this, the report pursues the following specific research objectives. First, the study aims to critically analyze the constitutional safeguards pertaining to child rights in India, interpreting the intersection of Fundamental

Rights and Directive Principles through the jurisprudential lens of constitutional morality. Second, it seeks to conduct a forensic legal evaluation of the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016, specifically identifying statutory loopholes such as the family enterprise exemption and the reduction of hazardous classifications and detailing their socio-economic implications on vulnerable, caste-marginalized demographics.

Third, the research is designed to assess the impact of judicial activism and landmark Supreme Court pronouncements in shaping the regulatory and rehabilitative framework for working children, evaluating how the judiciary has historically compensated for legislative and executive deficits. Fourth, the report aims to evaluate the operational efficacy of current administrative and rehabilitative mechanisms. This involves a critical audit of the digital PENCiL portal, the historical performance of the National Child Labour Project (NCLP), and the operational challenges arising from their recent convergence with the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan. Finally, the objective is to synthesize these findings to propose actionable, evidence-based legal, administrative, and policy recommendations that can bridge the vast chasm between statutory intent and grassroots enforcement, drawing upon successful decentralized models.

Research Questions

To systematically address the research objectives, this study investigates the following core questions. How do the fundamental rights and directive principles of the Indian Constitution interact to establish a mandatory doctrine of constitutional morality that requires the absolute protection of children from economic exploitation? In what specific ways do the legislative exemptions provided under the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 specifically the broad definition of the "family enterprise" clause and the truncated hazardous occupation schedule undermine the Right to Education Act and violate international labour standards?

Furthermore, to what extent have landmark judicial interventions, such as those concerning the Sivakasi match factories and circus trafficking, succeeded in imposing actionable accountability on the State regarding the rescue, financial compensation, and long-term rehabilitation of child labourers? What are the systemic bottlenecks, funding gaps, and administrative failures hindering the effectiveness of digital monitoring platforms like PENCiL and rehabilitation schemes transitioning into the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan? Finally, how can grassroots interventions, such as the poverty-eradication models in Kerala and the Bal Mitra Gram framework, inform national policy to address the root socio-economic causes of child labour?

Research Hypotheses

This research is guided by two primary hypotheses formulated upon an initial review of the socio-legal landscape. The first hypothesis posits that the statutory exemptions embedded within the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016, particularly the legalization of labour within family enterprises and the reclassification of hazardous industries, fundamentally dilute the absolute prohibition of child labour. It is hypothesized that these provisions act as a legal shield for exploitative unorganized sectors, contravening

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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

the constitutional mandates of Article 24 (prohibition of hazardous employment) and Article 21A (right to free and compulsory education) by prioritizing socio-economic custom over constitutional morality.

The second hypothesis asserts that the lack of structural convergence and adequate financial tracking between digital enforcement mechanisms (such as the PENCiL portal) and educational rehabilitation frameworks (such as the transition from NCLP to Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan) results in high recidivism rates among rescued child labourers. It is hypothesized that without targeted economic compensation for the parents and specialized socio-psychological bridging education for the rescued child, the broader educational frameworks fail to prevent the child from being pushed back into the workforce, thereby rendering the initial rescue operations functionally ineffective.

Research Methodology

This study adopts a highly analytical, doctrinal research methodology, combining a critical examination of black-letter law with socio-legal jurisprudence to evaluate the framework governing child labour in India. The research relies heavily on primary legal sources, which form the bedrock of the analysis. These include the Constitution of India (specifically Parts III and IV), the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act (including the foundational 1986 statute and the pivotal 2016 amendments), the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act (2009), the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act (2015), and the Factories Act (1948). Furthermore, the study meticulously analyzes landmark judgments delivered by the Supreme Court of India, tracing the evolution of judicial directives regarding child rights and employer liability. Secondary sources have been extensively consulted to assess the empirical reality and socio-legal critiques of the existing laws, moving beyond theoretical text to actual implementation. These include reports and data from the International Labour Organization (ILO), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR), and the 2023 reports from the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour. Additionally, scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and independent socio-economic audits such as data extracted from the PENCiL portal, the National Crime Records Bureau (NCRB), and the Census of India have been synthesized. The data is utilized to construct a fluid narrative that evaluates the causal relationships between legislative loopholes, socio-economic vulnerabilities, and enforcement failures. Quantitative data is presented via structured tables to provide clear, comparative insights without disrupting the qualitative, expert narrative of the report.

Literature Review

The academic and policy discourse surrounding child rights and labour in India has undergone a profound evolution over the past several decades. Historically, early legislative philosophy operated on the pragmatic, albeit controversial, premise that child labour was an inescapable economic reality in a developing nation. This viewpoint was heavily influenced by the Gurupadaswamy Committee Report (1979), which argued that the total elimination of child labour would be unfeasible and impractical as long as systemic poverty persisted.[8] Consequently, the intellectual foundation of the initial Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986, was not abolitionist; rather, it sought to "prohibit" exploitative and hazardous forms of child labour while attempting to "regulate" the practice in all remaining sectors of work.[9]

However, legal literature indicates that the insertion of Article 21A (Right to Education) via the 86th Constitutional Amendment in 2002 initiated a severe paradigm shift in jurisprudential thought. Scholars and legal experts argue that the constitutional guarantee of free and compulsory education for children aged 6 to 14 effectively rendered all forms of child labour logically and constitutionally

incompatible with the State's mandate.[10] The academic consensus shifted toward the view that a child cannot simultaneously function as a full-time worker and

a full-time student, making the regulatory approach of the 1986 Act obsolete and constitutionally suspect.

The literature analyzing the subsequent Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016, frequently critiques the legislature for failing to capitalize on this constitutional paradigm shift. Analysts note that while the 2016 Act ostensibly imposes a blanket ban on child labour below 14 years to align with the RTE Act, it introduces a retrogressive "family enterprise" exception that severely undermines its own premise.[11] This exception is widely criticized in sociological and legal literature for reinforcing caste-based ancestral occupations. Scholars argue that it disproportionately affects children in rural and marginalized communities, trapping them in a cyclical mechanism of poverty and denying them human capital development.[12] Furthermore, human rights organizations and the ILO have expressed grave concerns in their global reports over the 2016 amendment's drastic reduction of the hazardous occupations list from numerous specific processes to merely those defined under the Factories Act, 1948. Literature points out that this legislative shrinkage leaves millions of children vulnerable in the unorganized sector, where the vast majority of child labour in India actually occurs.[13]

The discourse on the post-rescue rehabilitation of child labourers highlights a persistent disconnect between the act of rescue and successful socio-economic reintegration. Reports by the Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour (2023) emphasize the sheer ambiguity in the definition of a 'child' across various overlapping employment laws and the utter inadequacy of punitive measures to serve as a deterrent.[14] Scholars evaluating rehabilitation programs point out that the recent transition from the dedicated National Child Labour Project (NCLP) to the broader Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan lacks a cohesive tracking mechanism. Academic studies on recidivism show that rescued children frequently slip back into the workforce due to the unaddressed economic vulnerability of their families.[15] Conversely, literature focusing on successful eradication models such as the Kerala model of poverty alleviation (Kudumbashree) and the Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation's Bal Mitra Gram (BMG) framework argues

that community-led, decentralized interventions that address the root causes of adult poverty are vastly more effective than top-down punitive legislation.[16] The synthesis of this literature indicates that while the legal framework has expanded, it remains compromised by socioeconomic concessions, requiring a deeper alignment with constitutional morality.

Research & Analysis

Constitutional Jurisprudence and the Doctrine of Constitutional Morality

The Constitution of India is not merely a static legal charter; it is a transformative, living document designed to dismantle entrenched social hierarchies, eradicate systemic exploitation, and protect the most vulnerable demographics within the newly independent republic. Children, by virtue of their tender age, physical immaturity, psychological malleability, and total lack of political voice or franchise, occupy the absolute apex of this vulnerability. The protection of children is intricately woven into the fabric of both Fundamental Rights (Part III) and the Directive Principles of State Policy (Part IV), creating a positive, non-negotiable obligation on the State to ensure their holistic development and protection from economic predation.

Article 24 stands as the central, unequivocal pillar of child labour prohibition in the Constitution. It explicitly mandates that no child below the age of 14 years shall be employed to

work in any factory, mine, or engaged in any other hazardous employment.[17] This provision acknowledges the extreme physical risks associated with industrial labour. However, while Article 24 prohibits hazardous employment, Article 23 provides a broader shield against systemic exploitation, prohibiting traffic in human beings and *begar* (forced, unpaid labour).[18] Given that a vast proportion of child labour in India involves debt bondage where children are forced to work to pay off intergenerational family loans Article 23 is highly applicable to the rescue and rehabilitation of bonded child labourers. In addition to these specific protections, children inherently possess rights as equal citizens, including the right to equality before the law (Article 14),[19] the right against discrimination (Article 15), and the fundamental right to life and personal liberty with due process (Article 21).[20] Notably, Article 15(3) empowers the

State to make special, affirmative provisions for women and children, allowing the legislature to enact protective laws that discriminate in favor of the child's welfare.[21]

The constitutional jurisprudence surrounding child rights was fundamentally altered and strengthened by the 86th Amendment Act of 2002. This amendment elevated the Right to Education from a mere Directive Principle (formerly housed under Article 45) to an enforceable Fundamental Right under the newly inserted Article 21A.[22] Article 21A places a strict mandate on the State to provide free, compulsory, and elementary education to all children between the ages of 6 and 14 years. This created a powerful, unavoidable legal intersection: if the State is constitutionally mandated to ensure a child is physically present in a school environment, any legislative, executive, or societal framework that permits that child to be in the workforce during their formative years is inherently unconstitutional. The Directive Principles further reinforce this holistic ethos. Article 39(e) directs the State to ensure that the health and strength of workers, and the "tender age of children," are not abused, and that citizens are not forced by economic necessity to enter vocations unsuited to their age or physical strength.[23] Furthermore, Article 39(f) mandates that children must be given opportunities and facilities to develop in a healthy manner, in conditions of freedom and dignity, explicitly protecting childhood and youth against moral and material abandonment.[24] Additional directives under Article 45 (recast to focus on early childhood care below age six), Article 46 (protection of weaker sections from social injustice), and Article 47 (raising the level of nutrition and public health) construct a comprehensive welfare mandate.[25]

To analyze the efficacy of these provisions properly, legal experts must invoke the doctrine of "Constitutional Morality." As expounded by Dr. B.R. Ambedkar and expanded upon in contemporary Supreme Court jurisprudence (such as in *Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India*), constitutional morality goes far beyond the literal, mechanical interpretation of the constitutional text. It represents the core values of justice, liberty, equality, and fraternity, acting as a crucial counterweight to "popular morality" or societal norms.[26] In India's pluralistic society, deeply entrenched cultural traditions and brutal economic realities often normalize the labour of children especially within marginalized castes, tribal communities, and impoverished

rural families. Popular morality might accept child labour as a pragmatic economic necessity for survival or as a traditional transfer of artisanal skills. However, constitutional morality demands that the State aggressively dismantle these exploitative norms.[27] Applying this transformative doctrine to working children dictates that poverty cannot be utilized as a legitimate defense by the State, the society, or the employer to tolerate child labour. The constitutional right to a dignified childhood, health, and education must invariably supersede the economic compulsions of the family unit and the profit-maximizing motives of the commercial employer.

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

The Legislative Framework: A Critical Exegesis of the CLPRA 2016

The primary statutory mechanism addressing child labour in the country is the Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986. Following intense domestic and international pressure to align labour laws with the mandates of the RTE Act (2009), the government introduced a highly controversial overhaul via the 2016 Amendment. While the State presented the 2016 Amendment as a progressive milestone that finally imposed a blanket ban on the employment of children under 14, a critical forensic examination reveals severe legislative regressions that cater to industry and unorganized sector demands.[28]

The Age Threshold and Definitional Ambiguity

The 2016 Act introduces a bifurcated demographic definition, distinguishing between a "child" (defined as a person below 14 years of age, or the age specified in the RTE Act, whichever is higher) and an "adolescent" (defined as a person between 14 and 18 years of age).[29] The Act purportedly bans the employment of a "child" in any occupation, while prohibiting the employment of an "adolescent" only in hazardous occupations. However, this framework fails to harmonize with broader protective legislation. The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, explicitly defines a child as any person below 18 years of age, aligning with Article 1 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child (UNCRC).[30] By maintaining the 14-year threshold for absolute prohibition, the CLPRA 2016 obscures the legal determination of child status and leaves adolescents highly vulnerable to exploitation in non-hazardous, yet deeply abusive, work environments.

The "Family Enterprise" Loophole: Legalizing Exploitation

The most highly criticized and damaging inclusion in the 2016 Amendment is Section 3, which carves out exceptions to the blanket ban. The provision permits children under 14 to help their family or a "family enterprise" after school hours or during vacations, provided the occupations are not officially classified as hazardous.[31] The legal definitions provided in the Act are dangerously expansive. "Family" is defined broadly to include not just biological parents and siblings, but also the siblings of parents (uncles and aunts). Furthermore, a "family enterprise" is defined to encompass any manufacture, trade, or business performed by family members, crucially allowing for the engagement of other external persons.

This proviso effectively acts as a statutory cloaking mechanism for the exploitation of children in the unorganized and informal sectors. In India, deeply entrenched caste structures heavily dictate occupational roles. By legally sanctioning children to work in "family enterprises," the law inadvertently reifies ancestral, caste-based occupations such as carpet weaving, beedi rolling, bangle making, zari embroidery, and agricultural labour thereby severely hindering socio-economic mobility and human capital development among marginalized castes. More nefariously, commercial subcontractors and supply chain managers frequently exploit this loophole. To avoid the purview of formal factory inspections, production is outsourced to domestic homes in rural areas or slums. Here, children are passed off as "assistants" or apprentices to adult family members, functioning as invisible, unpaid, or heavily underpaid labour.

The legislative stipulation that such work must not "affect the school education of the child" is a functionally toothless proviso. There is absolutely no standardized metric, threshold, or administrative capacity for District Magistrates who are already severely overburdened to monitor the physical fatigue, psychological strain, and academic impairment of an impoverished child who works in a home-based enterprise after attending school. The law ignores the reality that exhaustion from labour directly impedes learning outcomes. Furthermore, the Act also exempts children working in the audio-visual entertainment

industry (excluding circuses), a sector known for rigorous routines and psychological trauma, lacking a compelling rationale for this exclusion.

Dilution of the Hazardous Occupations List

Another glaring regression in the 2016 Amendment, and perhaps the most dangerous to child health, is the drastic reduction in the classification of hazardous occupations. The original 1986 Act, acting on years of occupational health research, listed 18 specific occupations and 65 processes as hazardous to children. The 2016 Amendment removed this comprehensive schedule entirely, substituting it with a severely truncated list comprising only 3 occupations (mines, inflammable substances, explosives) and 29 processes borrowed from the Factories Act of 1948.[32]

To illustrate the magnitude of this dilution, the following table compares the statutory frameworks:

Feature	CLPRA 1986	CLPRA Amendment 2016	Implications of Statutory Change
Hazardous Schedule	18 Occupations, 65 Processes (Comprehensive)	3 Occupations, 29 Processes (Borrowed from Factories Act)	Removes critical protections for children/adolescents in high-risk sectors like brick kilns, chemical pesticide handling, slaughterhouses, and e-waste scavenging.[33]
Age Classification	Prohibited below 14 in hazardous sectors. Regulated elsewhere.	"Child" (<14) fully banned except family. "Adolescent" (14-18) banned in hazardous.	Creates irreconcilable conflict with the Juvenile Justice Act (2015) and UNCRC, which define a child as anyone under 18.[34]
Family Enterprises	No specific exemption for commercial family business.	Legalized work after school hours/vacations for children under 14.	Perpetuates caste-based labour roles and provides a legal shield for exploitative supply chain subcontractors.[35]
Punitive Measures	Lighter penalties.	Increased penalties, made cognizable offense. First offense for parents exempt.	While employer penalties increased, the reduction of the hazardous list means fewer employers can actually be prosecuted.[36]

This legislative shrinkage means that highly dangerous work environments such as brick kilns, gemstone cutting, cotton ginning, and domestic work are no longer legally classified as hazardous for children.[37] This failure to maintain a comprehensive hazardous work list puts India significantly out of compliance with international frameworks. Despite the

government's highly publicized ratification of ILO Convention 138 (Minimum Age) and Convention 182 (Worst Forms of Child Labour) in June 2017,[38] the domestic law fails to meet the treaty standards. The United States Department of Labor has repeatedly noted in its global findings (including 2016, 2023, and 2024 reports) that India's hazardous work prohibitions are not comprehensive and fail to encompass all environments where evidence shows children work under unsafe and unhealthy conditions for long periods.[39]

Judicial Activism: The Supreme Court as the Sentinel on the Qui Vive

In the face of persistent legislative loopholes, statutory dilution, and executive lethargy, the Supreme Court of India has frequently stepped into the breach, utilizing public interest litigation (PIL) to enforce constitutional mandates. The judiciary has consciously acted as the *sentinel on the qui vive* (the watchful guardian), expansively interpreting Article 21 (Right to Life and Dignity) and Article 24 to craft comprehensive rescue and rehabilitation frameworks that the legislature failed to provide.

The absolute watershed moment in child labour jurisprudence was the landmark judgment in

M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu (1996).[40] Investigating the rampant, life-threatening use of children in the hazardous matchstick and fireworks factories of Sivakasi, the Supreme Court delivered a blistering critique of state inaction. The Court pragmatically recognized that an immediate, absolute legal ban on child labour, without corresponding socio-economic support, would be counter-productive; it would simply drive the exploitative practice underground or lead to the starvation of the impoverished families who relied on the child's meager income.

Consequently, the Court established a definitive, enforceable economic framework for rehabilitation. It mandated that offending employers must pay a fine of Rs. 20,000 per child, which was to be deposited into a newly created "Child Labour Rehabilitation-cum-Welfare Fund" exclusively for the benefit of the rescued child. Crucially, the Court directed the State Government to provide alternative employment to an adult member of the rescued child's family. If the State could not fulfill this obligation to provide an adult job, it was legally obligated to contribute an additional Rs. 5,000 to the welfare fund per child. This judgment was revolutionary because it firmly established the socio-legal principle that the eradication of child labour is intrinsically linked to the economic stabilization of the adult workforce, placing the burden of poverty alleviation directly on the State.

Further cementing its protective role, the Supreme Court addressed the horrific conditions of trafficked children in *Bachpan Bachao Andolan v. Union of India* (2011).[41] Responding to a PIL detailing the abuse of children forcefully detained in circuses under inhuman conditions, the Court noted blatant violations of fundamental rights, including the right to education and freedom from forced labour. The Court issued binding, specific directives ordering the government to conduct simultaneous raids to liberate children from all circuses. It mandated that rescued children be placed in Care and Protective Homes until they attain the age of 18, and that the State must design a proper scheme of rehabilitation. This case was instrumental in recognizing child trafficking as an organized crime, utilizing the Optional Protocol of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime (UNCTOC) to strengthen domestic law. It also solidified the role of the National Commission for Protection of Child Rights (NCPCR) and non-governmental organizations as vital components of the enforcement apparatus.

Similarly, in *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India* (1997), the Court connected the issue of child labour directly to the systemic, historical issue of bonded labour.[42] The Court observed

that compelling a child to work to pay off intergenerational parental debt is a severe violation of human dignity and Article 21. It reiterated that providing compulsory education and periodical health check-ups is a primary duty of the State, essential for the stability of democracy and the elimination of social tensions. These landmark rulings highlight a consistent judicial philosophy: the burden of resolving child labour rests on the State's capacity to provide economic alternatives, robust enforcement, and mandatory education, rather than merely penalizing the impoverished families who are victims of systemic inequality.

Administrative Mechanisms, the PENCiL Portal, and Audits of Enforcement

The translation of constitutional mandates and judicial directives into administrative reality occurs through state enforcement mechanisms and rehabilitation schemes. However, independent audits, labor department statistics, and ground-level analyses reveal severe operational dysfunctions and a lack of systemic convergence.

The PENCiL Portal: Technological Promise vs. Ground Reality

In an effort to centralize enforcement and data tracking, the government launched the Platform for Effective Enforcement for No Child Labour (PENCiL) portal in September 2017.[43] The portal was designed as an online mechanism to enforce the CLPRA and implement the National Child Labour Project (NCLP), connecting the Central Government, State Governments, District Nodal Officers (DNOs), and the general public. It features components such as a complaint corner, a child tracking system, and state resource centers.

Despite its technological promise, an audit of the PENCiL portal's efficacy yields underwhelming results. Data indicates a massive, systemic disparity between the actual prevalence of child labour and the cases reported and resolved through the portal. Between September 2017 and May 2024, only 4,606 cases of child labour were reported on the PENCiL platform nationwide.[44] This figure represents a staggering underrepresentation when juxtaposed against the 10.12 million child labourers identified in the 2011 Census.[45]

Furthermore, research on the portal's outcomes highlights a severe bottleneck in rehabilitation. While operations such as 'Operation Smile' and 'Operation Muskaan' rescued approximately 70,000 children between 2015 and 2017,[46] the downstream rehabilitation is failing. Statistics show that while a percentage of children are identified and withdrawn from work, a mere fraction approximately 8% are successfully "mainstreamed" and provided with institutional and financial rehabilitation.[47] The enforcement system is plagued by low prosecution rates against employers, inconsistent policies across states, and the improper handling of cases by local police, rendering the deterrent effect of the 2016 Amendment's enhanced penalties largely null.[48]

Rehabilitation Frameworks: From NCLP to Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan

For decades, the National Child Labour Project (NCLP), initiated in 1988, served as the flagship Central Sector Scheme for rehabilitation.[49] The scheme operated by funding Special Training Centres (STCs) through District Project Societies. These centers provided rescued children (aged 9-14) with bridge education, vocational training, monthly stipends, health care, and mid-day meals to prepare them for integration into formal schooling.

To understand the scale of the NCLP's prior operations, it is useful to examine the grant-in-aid distribution. The following table highlights the funds released to major high-prevalence states prior to the scheme's dissolution:

INDIAN JOURNAL OF LEGAL REVIEW [IJLR – IF SCORE – 7.58]
VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026
APIS – 3920 - 0001 *(and)* ISSN - 2583-2344
Published by
Institute of Legal Education
https://iledu.in

State	2014-15 (Rs. in Lakh)	2016-17 (Rs. in Lakh)	2018-19 (Rs. in Lakh)	Trend Observation
Assam	471.64	257.30	1109.45	Highly volatile funding, indicating inconsistent operations despite high child labour prevalence.[50]
Maharashtra	830.08	1192.54	106.19	Drastic reduction in funding by 2018-19, suggesting a winding down of targeted STCs.[51]
Madhya Pradesh	768.71	878.68	514.34	Consistent but declining funding, pointing toward reduced institutional capacity.[52]
Bihar	1071.82	168.92	0.00	Complete cessation of NCLP funds by 2018-19 in a highly endemic source state.[53]

As of April 1, 2021, the NCLP was officially subsumed under the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan (SSA), a comprehensive program for school education.[54] While this convergence under the Ministry of Education makes theoretical sense to align with the RTE Act, experts argue that the transition has created a critical vacuum in dedicated rehabilitation.[55] The SSA is a broad educational framework designed for the general populace; it lacks the specialized, highly targeted socio-psychological support systems that traumatized child labourers require.[56]

Evidence suggests that children transitioning directly from hazardous labour to formal schooling face extremely high dropout rates. This is primarily due to the ongoing economic vulnerability of their households and the sudden lack of sustained parental compensation or targeted stipends that the NCLP previously provided.[57] Without the close monitoring managed by District Project Societies, many children are pushed back into the workforce, particularly following the economic shocks of the COVID-19 pandemic.[58] The Parliamentary Standing Committee on Labour, in its 2023 report, highlighted the necessity of dedicated district corpus funds for immediate relief and rehabilitation, expressly noting that current generalized mechanisms are failing to prevent recidivism among rescued children.[59] The Committee also pointed out the persistent ambiguity in the definition of a 'child' across employment laws, calling for a uniform legal standard to enable effective enforcement.[60]

Best Practices and Grassroots Eradication Models

To effectively counter the systemic failures of top-down legislative and administrative mechanisms, it is imperative to analyze successful grassroots and decentralized models that address the socio-economic root causes of child labour.

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

VOLUME 6 AND ISSUE 7 OF 2026

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

Published by

Institute of Legal Education

https://iledu.in

The Kerala Model of Poverty Alleviation

The state of Kerala stands out as a unique demographic and economic model that has effectively utilized decentralized governance and comprehensive social welfare to nearly eradicate child labour. This success is not merely due to strict policing or penal enforcement, but rather a holistic, socio-economic approach to poverty eradication. Initiatives like the *Kudumbashree* program (a massive, female-led poverty reduction project) and the *Athidaridrya Nirmarjana* project have actively surveyed, identified, and uplifted the extremely poor outside the standard support systems.[61]

As noted economist Amartya Sen observed, Kerala's social development relies heavily on a history of extensive public action, robust labour movements, high investments in education, and accessible public health. By ensuring that adult family members have stable, protected incomes and access to social safety nets, Kerala effectively removes the desperate economic compulsion that drives children into the workforce. The Kerala model empirically proves that comprehensive poverty eradication and the protection of adult labour rights are absolute prerequisites for the elimination of child labour.[62]

The Bal Mitra Gram (BMG) Model

Developed by the Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation, the Bal Mitra Gram (Child-Friendly Village) is a flagship community empowerment model that targets child labour at its geographical source.[63] Rather than relying solely on external state actors or delayed bureaucratic rescues, the BMG model mobilizes the entire village community to act as primary stakeholders in child protection.

The model focuses on generating acute awareness at the grassroots level about child rights and the long-term economic value of education. It essentially works to change the social fabric and "popular morality" of the village to actively reject child labour The model integrates children into local governance mechanisms, such as establishing *Bal Panchayats* (Children's Parliaments), giving them direct agency over their educational environments. Expanding such community intervention models, especially in source states with high endemic poverty like Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, and Jharkhand, is highly recommended by sociological studies as a vital strategy to bridge the vast gap between statutory law in New Delhi and grassroots reality in rural India.[64]

Suggestions and Recommendations

The persistence of child labour in India is a deeply complex socio-legal issue that cannot be eradicated by punitive legislation alone. It requires targeted legislative amendments, robust administrative convergence, and decentralized socio-economic community action. Based on the exhaustive analysis of the existing framework and its documented challenges, the following recommendations are proposed to align the State's actions with its constitutional morality:

Legislative Amendments to the CLPRA 2016:

The legislature must urgently review and amend Section 3 of the 2016 Amendment. The exemption provided for "family enterprises" must be revoked, as it provides an egregious loophole for subcontractors and perpetuates caste-based occupational segregation. If total revocation is politically unfeasible, the definition of "family" must be strictly limited to immediate biological parents, and a "family enterprise" must explicitly exclude any business linked to a commercial supply chain, third-party contractor, or piece-rate production. Furthermore, the government must utilize Section 4 of the Act to re-expand the Schedule of Hazardous Occupations. The current reliance on the Factories Act is inadequate. A comprehensive list of hazardous occupations specifically including brick kiln work, zari making, chemical pesticide handling, domestic work, and e-waste scavenging must be reinstated and unequivocally banned for all persons under

18 years of age, bringing India into full compliance with ILO Conventions 138 and 182. Finally, the discrepancy in the definition of a "child" must be resolved by harmonizing the CLPRA with the Juvenile Justice Act, 2015, establishing a uniform legal standard that defines a child as any person below the age of 18.

Strengthening Administrative and Rehabilitative Frameworks:

The Ministry of Labour and Employment must overhaul the PENCiL portal to ensure real-time data convergence with the Ministry of Education (Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan), the Ministry of Women and Child Development, and local police databases. A mandatory tracking mechanism using secure, privacy-compliant data should be implemented to track rescued children from the point of rescue through their entire educational journey, thereby preventing recidivism. Furthermore, acting on the recommendations of the Parliamentary

Standing Committee on Labour, the government must mandate the creation of dedicated District Corpus Funds. These funds should provide immediate financial compensation to rescued children and alternative livelihood support to their parents, codifying the Supreme Court's mandate in the *M.C. Mehta* case into statutory law. Given the dissolution of the NCLP, the Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan must be augmented to include specialized 'Bridge Education Modules.' The state must deploy trained socio-psychological counselors in rural and urban-slum schools to address the specific traumas and severe academic lags of rescued child labourers, ensuring they are not forced to compete unassisted in the formal education system.

Community Empowerment and Socio-Economic Convergence:

To sever the root cause of child labour, the State must recognize that child exploitation is a symptom of adult poverty. The government must aggressively enforce adult minimum wage laws and expand the scope and funding of social safety nets like the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act (MGNREGA). Elevating the adult out of extreme poverty is the most effective vaccine against child exploitation. Additionally, state governments, particularly in high-prevalence source areas, should officially adopt, scale, and fund community-led models akin to the Bal Mitra Gram (BMG). Empowering local Panchayats to declare their villages "Child Labour Free" through incentivized government grants can drive organic, sustainable change, replacing popular morality that accepts child labour with a localized understanding of constitutional morality.

Conclusion

The protection of working children in India demands a profound and urgent reconciliation between the nation's constitutional morality and its prevailing, deeply entrenched socio-economic practices. The Constitution of India, specifically through the mandates of Articles 21A, 24, and 39, paints a clear, aspirational vision of an equitable society where the innocence, physical health, and formal education of a child are inviolable rights, protected against the predations of the market. However, the legislative translation of this visionary framework, particularly through the regressive provisions of the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016, reveals a troubling capitulation to the status quo. By carving out broad exceptions for family enterprises and severely shrinking the scope of hazardous work classifications, the State has inadvertently sanitized and legalized the exploitation of millions of children in the informal and caste-based economic sectors.

While the Supreme Court of India has consistently acted as a formidable bulwark establishing crucial rehabilitation funds, mandating adult alternative employment, and instituting accountability mechanisms through landmark jurisprudence judicial activism alone cannot substitute for executive efficiency and

legislative rigor. The systemic failures observed in digital tracking platforms like the PENCiL portal, coupled with the transitional frictions and funding vacuums resulting from the shift from the NCLP to the generalized Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan, underscore a critical lack of convergence in post-rescue rehabilitation. When the State rescues a child but fails to economically stabilize the family unit or provide targeted, specialized educational reintegration, the cycle of poverty inevitably pushes the child back into the workforce, rendering the rescue a mere administrative illusion.

To meet the sustainable development target of eliminating child labour by 2025, India must adopt a zero-tolerance legislative framework free from convenient socio-economic loopholes. This must be matched by a decentralized, community-driven approach that directly addresses adult poverty the undisputed root cause of child exploitation.

Ultimately, honoring the rights of working children is not merely an obligation of international legal compliance; it is the ultimate test of India's constitutional morality and its authentic commitment to securing a humane, just, and equitable future for its most vulnerable citizens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Sources: Constitution and Statutes

- The Constitution of India.
- The Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Act 61 of 1986).
- The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016).
- The Factories Act, 1948 (Act 63 of 1948).
- The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act 2 of 2016).

International Conventions

- International Labour Organization, "Minimum Age Convention" (No. 138) (1973).
- United Nations, "Convention on the Rights of the Child" (1989).

Case Laws

- *Bachpan Bachao Andolan* v. *Union of India*, (2011) 5 SCC 1.
- *Bandhua Mukti Morcha* v. *Union of India*, (1997) 10 SCC 549.
- *M.C. Mehta* v. *State of Tamil Nadu*, (1996) 6 SCC 756.
- *Navtej Singh Johar* v. *Union of India*, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

Reports & Official Publications

- Government of India, "Census of India" (2011).
- Gurupadaswamy Committee, "Report of the Committee on Child Labour" (1979).
- International Labour Organization, "Child Labour: Global Estimates 2024, Trends and the Road Forward" (2024).
- Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation, "Bal Mitra Gram (BMG) Model" (2020).
- Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation, "Child Labour Projection Report" (2020).
- Ministry of Education, Government of India, "Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan Framework."
- Ministry of Labour & Employment, "361 Complaints of Child Labour Resolved Through Pencil Portal" (2019).
- Ministry of Labour and Employment, "National Child Labour Project (NCLP) Scheme."
- Standing Committee on Labour, "Report on the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2012" (2013).
- Standing Committee on Labour, Textiles and Skill Development, "Fifty-Second Report on National Policy on Child Labour – An Assessment" (2023).
- UNICEF, "Child labour schooling India Report" (2024).

- United States Department of Labor, "Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: India" (2024).

Articles and Secondary Materials

- Amartya Sen, "Kerala's Development Model" (2000).
- Jawed Alam Khan, "Assessing Budgetary Priorities for the Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour" (Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, 2018).
- Neera Burra, "Child labour in rural areas with a special focus on migration, agriculture, mining and brick kilns" (National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, 2009).
- S. Bhatt, "Assessing sustainability and effectiveness of government's rehabilitation initiatives for trafficked child labourers in Bihar" (Delhi School of Social Work Society, 2015).

ENDNOTES

1 Government of India, "Census of India" (2011).

2 International Labour Organization, "Child Labour: Global Estimates 2024, Trends and the Road Forward" (2024).

3 United Nations, "Sustainable Development Goals," Target 8.7.

4 The Constitution of India, art. 23.

5 The Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Act 61 of 1986).

6 Neera Burra, "Child labour in rural areas with a special focus on migration, agriculture, mining and brick kilns" (National Commission for Protection of Child Rights, 2009).

7 The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016).

8 Gurupadaswamy Committee, "Report of the Committee on Child Labour" (1979).

9 The Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Act 61 of 1986), s. 3.

10 The Constitution of India, art. 21A.

11 The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016), s. 3.

12 Ibid.

13 Standing Committee on Labour, "Report on the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Bill, 2012" (2013).

14 Standing Committee on Labour, Textiles and Skill Development, "Fifty-Second Report on National Policy on Child Labour – An Assessment" (2023).

15 S. Bhatt, "Assessing sustainability and effectiveness of government's rehabilitation initiatives for trafficked child labourers in Bihar" (Delhi School of Social Work Society, 2015).

16 Jawed Alam Khan, "Assessing Budgetary Priorities for the Rehabilitation of Bonded Labour" (Centre for Budget and Governance Accountability, 2018).

17 The Constitution of India, art. 24.

18 The Constitution of India, art. 23.

19 The Constitution of India, art. 14.

20 The Constitution of India, art. 21.

21 The Constitution of India, art. 15(3).

22 The Constitution of India, art. 21A.

23 The Constitution of India, art. 39(e).

24 The Constitution of India, art. 39(f).

25 The Constitution of India, art. 47.

26 Navtej Singh Johar v. Union of India, (2018) 10 SCC 1.

27 Ibid.

28 The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016).

29 Ibid.

30 United Nations, "Convention on the Rights of the Child" (1989), art. 1.

31 The Child and Adolescent Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Act, 1986 (Act 61 of 1986), s. 3

32 The Factories Act, 1948 (Act 63 of 1948).

33 Standing Committee on Labour, "Report on the Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation)

Amendment Bill, 2012" (2013).

34 The Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015 (Act 2 of 2016).

35 The Child Labour (Prohibition and Regulation) Amendment Act, 2016 (Act 35 of 2016), s. 3.

36 United States Department of Labor, "Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: India" (2024).

37 Standing Committee on Labour, Textiles and Skill Development, "Fifty-Second Report on National Policy on Child Labour – An Assessment" (2023).

38 International Labour Organization, "Minimum Age Convention" (No. 138) (1973).

39 United States Department of Labor, "Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: India" (2024).

40 M.C. Mehta v. State of Tamil Nadu, (1996) 6 SCC 756.

41 Bachpan Bachao Andolan v. Union of India, (2011) 5 SCC 1.

42 Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India, (1997) 10 SCC 549.

43 Press Information Bureau, "Launching of Pencil Portal to Eliminate Child Labour" (Dec. 27, 2017).

44 Ministry of Labour & Employment, "361 Complaints of Child Labour Resolved Through Pencil Portal" (2019).

45 Government of India, "Census of India" (2011).

46 Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation, "Child Labour Projection Report" (2020).

47 Ibid.

48 United States Department of Labor, "Findings on the Worst Forms of Child Labor: India" (2024).

49 Ministry of Labour and Employment, "National Child Labour Project (NCLP) Scheme."

50 Press Information Bureau, "361 Complaints of Child Labour Resolved Through Pencil Portal" (2019).

51 Ibid.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid.

54 Ministry of Education, Government of India, "Samagra Shiksha Abhiyan Framework."

55 Ibid.

56 Ibid.

57 S. Bhatt, "Assessing sustainability and effectiveness of government's rehabilitation initiatives for trafficked child labourers in Bihar" (Delhi School of Social Work Society, 2015).

58 UNICEF, "Child labour schooling India Report" (2024).

59 Standing Committee on Labour, Textiles and Skill Development, "Fifty-Second Report on National Policy on Child Labour – An Assessment" (2023).

60 Ibid.

61 Amartya Sen, "Kerala's Development Model" (2000).

62 Ibid.

63 Kailash Satyarthi Children's Foundation, "Bal Mitra Gram (BMG) Model" (2020).

64 Ibid.