

# SUPREMO AMICUS

## INDIA'S FIRST AI INTEGRATED LAW JOURNAL

**Peer Reviewed, Refereed and Open access Journal**

- Available in 331+ International Libraries
- Indexed at 32 Databases



ISSN NO. 2456-9704  
**Volume 10 Issue 1**  
[www.supremoamicus.org](http://www.supremoamicus.org)



## DISCLAIMER

The information presented in this article is intended for general informational and educational purposes only. While every effort has been made to ensure that the content is accurate, up-to-date, and reliable at the time of publication, the editorial board and publisher make no representations or warranties of any kind, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, suitability, or availability of the information contained herein.

The views and opinions expressed in this article are those of the author and are based on personal research, experience, and interpretation. They do not necessarily reflect the official policy, position, or opinions of any affiliated organization, institution, or entity.

This article is not intended to serve as professional advice of any kind. The editorial board and publisher shall not be held liable for any errors or omissions in the content, nor for any losses, injuries, or damages arising from the use of or reliance on this information.



---

## ABOUT THE JOURNAL

Supremo Amicus is an online, peer-reviewed international journal devoted to the interdisciplinary fields of law and science. In an era marked by rapid technological progress and evolving legal frameworks, the journal seeks to bridge the gap between these two dynamic domains by offering comprehensive and critical insights into their various aspects. The journal places a strong emphasis on contemporary advancements, emerging trends, and the complex challenges faced by both the legal community.

The primary objective of the journal is to encourage and promote original, high-quality research. It is committed to publishing well-researched, analytically sound, and thought-provoking articles that adhere to rigorous academic standards. Each submission undergoes a thorough peer-review process to ensure authenticity, relevance, and scholarly integrity. In doing so, the journal maintains its commitment to excellence and credibility.

In addition to fostering research, the journal aims to make complex ideas accessible and engaging for a diverse readership. It strives to present content that is not only intellectually enriching but also clearly written and reader friendly.

Furthermore, the journal is committed to promoting interdisciplinary collaboration and global engagement. It welcomes diverse perspectives from contributors across different regions and backgrounds, thereby enriching the quality and scope of discussions presented within its pages.

With this vision we proudly present Supremo Amicus to our readers.

**-Editorial Team  
Supremo Amicus**



## RIGHT TO DISCONNECT AS A FUNDAMENTAL LABOR RIGHT: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

By *Apoorwa Pandey*

**Research Scholar**, Dr. C. V. Raman University,  
Kota, Bilaspur (C.G.)

### Abstract

India's rapidly digitizing workforce is currently experiencing unprecedented levels of digital overwork, with the normalization of an "always-on" corporate culture leading to severe burnout and mental health strain. In response to these modern occupational hazards, the Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025, was introduced in the Lok Sabha, proposing a statutory right for employees to ignore work-related calls, emails, and messages outside of mutually agreed working hours and on holidays. This paper provides a comprehensive constitutional, comparative, and socio-legal assessment of elevating the right to disconnect to a fundamental labor right in India. The paper evaluates the legal feasibility and administrative challenges of implementing such a framework within India's complex labor market. Ultimately, this research argues that institutionalizing the right to disconnect is not merely a policy preference, but a constitutional imperative necessary to protect worker well-being and realign labor protections with the realities of the modern digital economy.

**Keywords:** Right to Disconnect, Digital Overwork, Article 21 Jurisprudence, Occupational Health and Safety (OSH), Labor Rights.

### I. Introduction and Problem Statement

#### The Digital Paradigm Shift

Digital communication and remote work, accelerated by COVID-19, have transformed geographically bounded offices into a hyper-connected digital ecosystem (Dalal, 2026; International Labour Organization [ILO], 2024). While this paradigm shift has yielded unprecedented advancements in operational scalability, cross-border collaboration, and workflow flexibility, it has simultaneously eroded

the traditional spatial and temporal boundaries that historically separated the professional sphere from domestic life (NITI Aayog, 2022; Rahul & Shaifali, 2025).

The consequence of this dissolution is the rise of an "always-on" corporate culture. Armed with smartphones, laptops, and enterprise communication platforms, employees are now perpetually tethered to their organizational roles (Dalal, 2026; Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). The traditional nine-to-five workday has been replaced by a continuous stream of digital engagement, where the expectation of instantaneous availability routinely encroaches upon evenings, weekends, and holidays (Hamid, 2024; Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). This phenomenon has fundamentally altered the psychological contract between employers and employees, transforming off-duty hours from a period of guaranteed rest into a state of perpetual standby (ILO, 2024; NITI Aayog, 2022). As global organizations increasingly rely on hybrid and remote models, the inability to technologically detach has surfaced as one of the most pressing socio-legal challenges of the modern labor market (Fair Work Act, 2024; Jossierand, 2024).

#### Mental Health as an Occupational Hazard

The relentless demand for digital availability has precipitated a severe crisis in occupational health, primarily manifesting through psychological distress, burnout, and emotional exhaustion (Goh, Pfeffer, & Zenios, 2016; World Health Organization & ILO, 2024). The contemporary workforce is increasingly suffering from what organizational psychologists and researchers' term "telepressure" the internalized, persistent urge to respond immediately to work-related communications, irrespective of the hour (Santuzzi & Barber, 2018; Schulte et al., 2024). Coupled with this is the phenomenon of "info-obesity," a condition characterized by cognitive overload, chronic stress, and sleep deprivation caused by the constant monitoring and processing of an overwhelming volume of digital data and messaging (Amandeep & Gulati, 2020; Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).



International bodies and academic researchers have begun to recognize these phenomena not merely as personal management issues, but as severe occupational hazards. The International Labour Organization (ILO) and the World Health Organization (WHO) have published extensive data demonstrating that prolonged exposure to work-related psychosocial hazards including excessive workloads, lack of job control, and the erosion of the work-home interface can lead to severe physical and psychological injuries (ILO, 2024; WHO & ILO, 2024). A joint ILO/WHO report highlighted that working more than 55 hours a week increases the risk of stroke by 35% and heart disease by 17%, contributing to millions of work-related deaths globally (WHO & ILO, 2024). In India, the situation is particularly acute; the country operates under one of the longest statutory workweeks in the world, with surveys indicating that a vast majority of professionals routinely exceed 48 hours of work per week, leading to extraordinary levels of workforce burnout (Dalal, 2026; Seth, 2021). Despite these alarming metrics, traditional occupational safety paradigms have historically marginalized psychological well-being, focusing almost exclusively on physical workplace hazards (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020).

In light of the escalating mental health crisis precipitated by digital overwork, institutionalizing the “right to disconnect” can no longer be viewed merely as a progressive human resources policy or a corporate benefit. It is a constitutional imperative necessary to protect worker well-being, preserve human dignity, and adapt archaic labor protections for the realities of the modern digital economy (Hamid, 2024). Safeguarding the temporal autonomy of the individual mind requires robust statutory intervention to ensure that the fundamental right to life and liberty is not subsumed by the relentless demands of technological connectivity and exploitative economic coercion (Josserand, 2024; Schulte et al., 2024).

The rapid digitalization of the Indian workplace has precipitated an “always-on” corporate culture, resulting in unprecedented levels of digital overwork

and the blurring of professional and personal boundaries. Employees face relentless expectations to respond to work-related communications outside designated hours, leading to severe psychosocial hazards such as “info-obesity,” chronic stress, and sleep deprivation. Recent data indicates that nearly 78% of Indian professionals report experiencing burnout, a crisis exacerbated by the tragic consequences of extreme work pressure. Despite these alarming trends, India’s current labor regulatory framework remains anchored in traditional physical safety paradigms and fails to adequately address the psychological toll of continuous digital connectivity.

## II. Statutory Critique: India’s Current Labor Regime

### Context of the OSH Code, 2020

Recognizing the need to modernize and simplify its complex and highly fragmented labor regulatory framework, the Government of India undertook a historic legislative overhaul, consolidating 29 central labor laws into four comprehensive Labor Codes (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). Central to this reform is the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 (OSH Code), which subsumed 13 existing central acts.

### Strengths and Traditional Focus

The OSH Code represents a significant advancement in formalizing employment conditions and fortifying the traditional architecture of industrial labor protection (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). It mandates the issuance of formal appointment letters to all employees, thereby formalizing the employer-employee relationship and reducing exploitation (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). Furthermore, the Code strictly regulates maximum daily working hours capping them at eight hours per day and standardizes welfare provisions such as canteens, restrooms, potable drinking water, and crèche facilities across various sectors (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020).

The legislation meticulously outlines the duties of employers to provide a working environment free



from hazards that cause physical injury or occupational diseases (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). By harmonizing these baseline standards across factories, mines, plantations, and construction sites, the Code successfully ensures that the fundamental physical safety of the organized workforce is legally mandated and monitored by Inspector-Cum-Facilitators (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020).

### The Regulatory Lacuna

Despite its administrative and procedural successes, a critical analysis of the OSH Code reveals a profound regulatory lacuna regarding the realities of the 21st-century digitized workplace (Amandeep & Gulati, 2020; Shubhi, 2025). The Code's conceptualization of workplace safety remains strictly tethered to the physical realm addressing tangible threats such as toxic chemicals, dangerous machinery, ventilation, and lighting (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). It fails entirely to define, acknowledge, or regulate psychosocial hazards, digital monitoring, or work-induced mental health crises (Amandeep & Gulati, 2020; van der Molen et al., 2020).

The Third Schedule of the Code, which provides the statutory list of notifiable occupational diseases, focuses on physical ailments but conspicuously omits stress, clinical burnout, depression, and other mental health disorders, leaving workers without statutory recourse for psychological injuries sustained due to chronic overwork (Amandeep & Gulati, 2020). Furthermore, the Code operates on a fundamentally spatial premise; it governs what happens within the physical boundaries of a recognized "establishment" (Ministry of Labour and Employment, 2020). It does not account for the pervasive phenomenon of "invisible labor" the uncompensated, unrecognized, and continuous work performed via emails, messaging applications, and virtual meetings after the employee has physically departed the premises or logged off from their remote workstation (Rahul & Shaifali, 2025). By ignoring the psychological toll of continuous digital connectivity, the OSH Code leaves a vast segment of the modern workforce unprotected

against the most prevalent hazards of the contemporary economy (ILO, 2024; Shubhi, 2025).

### III. The Proposed Remedy: The Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025

#### Legislative Overview

To address the statutory void left by the OSH Code, Nationalist Congress Party Member of Parliament Supriya Sule introduced the Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025, in the Lok Sabha (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). This private member's bill seeks to formally recognize and legally empower an employee's right to disengage from official communications including telephone calls, emails, and messaging platforms outside of mutually agreed working hours and on holidays (Dalal, 2026; Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). While private member's bills historically face low probabilities of enactment in the Indian Parliament, the introduction of this legislation has catalyzed a vital national discourse regarding work-life boundaries, the ethics of unpaid overtime, and corporate accountability in an increasingly borderless digital workspace (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).

#### Key Statutory Mechanisms

The Bill proposes a comprehensive structural framework designed to enforce digital boundaries systematically. Rather than relying on individual employees to push back against organizational culture, the legislation mandates institutional compliance through several key mechanisms (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).

First, the Bill mandates the creation of an **Employees' Welfare Authority**, an apex regulatory body chaired by the Minister of State for Electronics and Information Technology, with cross-ministerial representation (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). This Authority is tasked with overseeing the implementation of the right to disconnect, publishing annual reports on compliance, and conducting comprehensive baseline studies to quantify the impact of hyper-connectivity on the workforce (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).



Second, the Bill requires mandatory **Negotiation Charters**. Every registered company and society employing more than ten individuals must constitute an Employees' Welfare Committee to negotiate out-of-work hour protocols (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). These charters must explicitly define the parameters under which after-hours contact is permissible, thereby formalizing mutual agreements and eliminating ambiguity regarding employer expectations (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).

Third, acknowledging the physiological and psychological impacts of prolonged telepressure, the legislation places a positive obligation on the appropriate government to establish **Digital Detox Centres**. These centers are intended to provide counseling services to citizens and employees, promoting reasonable personal use of digital tools and assisting individuals in mitigating the adverse effects of info-obesity and digital burnout (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).

#### Enforcement and Penalties

The defining feature of the 2025 Bill is its stringent approach to enforcement, reflecting an understanding that voluntary corporate guidelines often fail to alter entrenched behavioral norms (Dalal, 2026). The legislation explicitly prohibits employers from taking any disciplinary action such as wage reductions, adverse performance reviews, or termination against employees who exercise their right to disconnect and refuse to respond to after-hours communications (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). Furthermore, if an employee voluntarily chooses to respond to work demands outside of their contracted hours, the Bill mandates that they be compensated with overtime pay at the normal wage rate (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025).

To serve as a robust deterrent, Section 19 of the Bill imposes a massive financial sanction on entities that violate its provisions (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025). Companies that fail to define out-of-work service conditions in their Charters, neglect to draft remote work policies, or persistently penalize employees for

exercising their rights are liable to pay a penalty calculated at 1% of the total employees' remuneration (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025; Shubhi, 2025). This penalty shifts the burden of establishing boundaries from the vulnerable individual employee to the systemic architecture of the organization, framing personal time as a non-negotiable right protected by severe financial liabilities (Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025; Shubhi, 2025).

#### IV. Constitutional Anchoring of the Right to Disconnect

The argument for the right to disconnect extends beyond statutory labor reform; it is deeply rooted in the progressive interpretation of Part III of the Indian Constitution, specifically Article 21, which guarantees the Right to Life and Personal Liberty (Dalal, 2026; Yadav, 2020). The Indian judiciary has consistently expanded the scope of Article 21, asserting that "life" implies more than mere animal existence and encompasses the right to live with human dignity (Constitution of India, art. 21; *In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident*, 2012).

#### Article 21 and the Right to Sleep

A cornerstone of this constitutional interpretation was established in the landmark Supreme Court ruling, *In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident* (2012). In analyzing the state's actions, the Court was compelled to evaluate the biological, psychological, and constitutional significance of sleep (*In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident*, 2012; Lee, 2016).

In his concurring opinion, Justice B.S. Chauhan observed that sleep is essential for maintaining the delicate balance of health necessary for survival and human regeneration (*In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident*, 2012). The Court ruled that arbitrary state or institutional intrusion into an individual's sleep constitutes a severe violation of the right to privacy and an infringement upon personal liberty (*In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident*, 2012). By logical extension, a corporate culture that utilizes digital tools to continuously interrupt an employee's rest periods inducing sleep deprivation, chronic stress, and



cognitive exhaustion fundamentally violates the physiological and privacy protections guaranteed under Article 21 (Lee, 2016; Yadav, 2020).

### The Right to Leisure and Human Dignity

The constitutional mandate for worker well-being is further illuminated by the jurisprudence established in *Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India* (1984). Originally a public interest litigation addressing the deplorable and inhumane conditions of bonded laborers in Haryana stone quarries, the Supreme Court utilized this case to weave the Directive Principles of State Policy specifically Articles 39(e), 39(f), 41, and 42 into the enforceable fabric of Article 21 (*Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, 1984).

The Court ruled that the right to live with human dignity is absolute and includes protection against exploitative economic coercion (*Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, 1984). It asserted that human dignity necessitates adequate shelter, nutrition, safe working conditions, and, crucially, the right to rest and leisure (*Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, 1984). The judiciary recognized that forced labor is not exclusively exacted through physical chains or violence; it can be compelled through economic vulnerability, poverty, and the fear of destitution (*Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, 1984). In the modern context, this precedent implies that employees who are implicitly coerced into answering work communications late at night due to the threat of career stagnation, poor performance reviews, or termination are being subjected to a contemporary violation of their fundamental right to human dignity and leisure (Dalal, 2026).

### Synthesizing Precedents: Digital Bondage

When the principles of *Ramlila Maidan* (the fundamental right to uninterrupted sleep and privacy) and *Bandhua Mukti Morcha* (freedom from economic coercion and the right to leisure) are synthesized, a compelling constitutional argument emerges (Lee, 2016). The hyper-connected corporate mandate for 24/7 digital availability functions as a subtle yet pervasive form of “digital bondage” (Yadav, 2020).

Though cloaked in the modern vernacular of “hustle culture,” “flexibility,” and “dedication,” the inability to detach from the digital workplace effectively shackles the worker to the employer long beyond the bounds of compensated labor (Dalal, 2026; Rahul & Shaifali, 2025). The technology that was promised to liberate workers has, in many instances, resulted in a form of digital totalitarianism that extracts surplus value from the employee’s personal time (Tubaro, Casilli, & Coville, 2020). Mandating the right to disconnect is therefore not merely a regulatory adjustment; it is a constitutional necessity to prevent the algorithmic and digital subsumption of an individual’s private life, ensuring that the fundamental liberties envisioned by the framers of the Constitution remain intact in the 21st century (Hamid, 2024; ILO, 2024).

### V. Comparative Legal Analysis

The movement to codify the right to disconnect has gained significant global momentum. A comparative analysis of jurisdictions that have implemented such laws provides vital insights into the various mechanisms of enforcement, compliance, and ideological framing (Hamid, 2024).

#### France

France became the first nation to formally recognize the right to disconnect through the enactment of the *El Khomri Law* (Law No. 2016-1088), which took effect in January 2017 (Boring, 2020; Code du travail, art. L2242-17, 2016). Rooted in early 2000s jurisprudence by the Cour de Cassation (the French Supreme Court), the law codified the right under Article L2242-17 of the French Labor Code (Code du travail, art. L2242-17, 2016).

The French model is fundamentally based on collective bargaining. It mandates that companies with 50 or more employees must hold annual negotiations to define the boundaries between professional and personal life and establish protocols for the use of digital tools (Code du travail, art. L2242-17, 2016). If an agreement cannot be reached, the employer is legally obligated to unilaterally implement a charter



outlining these boundaries (Code du travail, art. L2242-17, 2016). The efficacy of this statutory pioneering was demonstrated in a landmark 2018 ruling, where the French arm of *Rentokil Initial* was ordered by the Cour de Cassation to pay €60,000 to a former regional director (Boring, 2020). The court found that requiring the employee to leave his telephone permanently on to respond to subordinates or customers outside of working hours constituted a severe violation of his right to disconnect, necessitating substantial financial compensation (Boring, 2020).

### Colombia

Colombia has adopted an approach that elevates the right to disconnect beyond standard labor regulations to the level of inalienable human rights (Zuleta Martinez, 2023). Initially, Colombia passed Law 2191 of 2022 (the Right to Disconnect Law), which required employers to adopt internal policies guaranteeing disconnection (Zuleta Martinez, 2023). However, Article 6(a) of this law explicitly exempted employees in management, executive, and trust roles from these protections (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2023).

In a landmark decision, the Colombian Constitutional Court issued *Ruling C-331 of 2023*, resolving an appeal of unconstitutionality against this exemption (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2023; Zuleta Martinez, 2023). The Court struck down the exemption, declaring that the right to labor disconnection is a fundamental human right applicable to *all* employees, regardless of their position or rank (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2023). The Court reasoned that while management roles may not be subject to standard statutory workday limits, the employer's power is not absolute; the right to rest is inextricably linked to human dignity, physical health, and the reconciliation of family life (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2023). Consequently, employers must now guarantee the right to disconnect for executives based on criteria of "necessity and proportionality," ensuring that even senior leadership is protected from unmitigated digital

exhaustion (Constitutional Court of Colombia, 2023; Zuleta Martinez, 2023).

### Australia

Australia presents a highly pragmatic, market-oriented regulatory framework introduced via the *Fair Work Legislation Amendment (Closing Loopholes No. 2) Act 2024* (Fair Work Act, 2024; Fair Work Commission, 2024). Effective August 2024 for large businesses (and August 2025 for small businesses), the amendment grants employees a protected workplace right to refuse to monitor, read, or respond to contact or attempted contact from their employer or third parties (such as clients) outside of their working hours (Fair Work Act, 2024).

Crucially, the Australian model does not impose an absolute ban on employers sending after-hours communications; rather, it empowers the employee to ignore them unless the refusal is deemed "unreasonable" (Fair Work Commission, 2024). The legislation outlines a specific, multi-factor test to determine unreasonableness, which includes:

1. The reason for the contact or attempted contact.
2. The method of contact and the level of disruption it causes the employee.
3. The extent to which the employee is financially or non-financially compensated to remain available or work outside ordinary hours.
4. The nature of the employee's role and their level of responsibility.
5. The employee's personal circumstances, including family or caring responsibilities (Fair Work Act, 2024; Fair Work Commission, 2024).

If disputes arise, they must first be discussed at the workplace level. If unresolved, either party can apply to the Fair Work Commission (FWC) to issue orders stopping the unreasonable contact or preventing the employer from taking disciplinary action (Fair Work Commission, 2024).



## VI. Implementation Challenges in the Indian Context

While the constitutional and international rationales for institutionalizing the right to disconnect are compelling, operationalizing this right within the complex socio-economic fabric of India presents profound and unique challenges (Hamid, 2024).

### The Gig Economy and Algorithmic Management

The most complex implementation hurdle lies within India's rapidly expanding gig and platform economy, which is projected to employ tens of millions of workers by the end of the decade (NITI Aayog, 2022). Traditional labor laws, including the proposed Right to Disconnect Bill, are predicated on a formalized employer-employee relationship (Center for Applied Research in Data Science, 2024). Platform workers such as ride-hailing drivers, delivery personnel, and freelance micro-taskers are deliberately classified by technology companies as "independent contractors" or "partners," effectively circumventing standard working hour protections and welfare obligations (NITI Aayog, 2022).

More insidiously, these workers are subjected to "algorithmic management" automated, software-driven systems that allocate tasks, monitor performance in real-time, and dictate compensation without human oversight or empathy (Center for Applied Research in Data Science, 2024; Tubaro, Casilli, & Coville, 2020). These opaque algorithms are structurally designed to maximize platform scalability and cost-efficiency (Tubaro, Casilli, & Coville, 2020). Consequently, they frequently penalize workers who choose to disconnect or reject tasks by lowering their performance ratings, reducing their future earning opportunities, or invisibly suspending their accounts (a practice known as shadow-banning) (Gray & Suri, 2019; Salehi et al., 2015). Implementing a right to disconnect for this demographic is virtually impossible without piercing the veil of these algorithms to ensure that the fundamental choice to go offline does not trigger automated economic retaliation and algorithmic discrimination (Tubaro, Casilli, & Coville, 2020).

### The IT and Services Sector

India has established itself as the premier global hub for Information Technology (IT) services, Business Process Outsourcing (BPO), and Global Capability Centers (GCCs) (Aman-Ullah et al., 2023). This sector's foundational business model and competitive advantage rely heavily on seamless, real-time integration with clients across North America, Europe, and the Asia-Pacific (Aman-Ullah et al., 2023). The operational realities of cross-time-zone coordination, continuous software deployment, round-the-clock server maintenance, and emergency cybersecurity incident response necessitate a significant degree of 24/7 availability (Seth, 2021).

A rigid, blanket statutory prohibition on after-hours communication could severely disrupt these workflows and undermine the global competitiveness of the Indian IT sector (Dalal, 2026). Industry bodies frequently highlight that the flexibility to connect globally is precisely what drives the sector's exponential growth and foreign direct investment (Seth, 2021). Therefore, any legislative intervention must carefully balance the protection of employee mental health with the inherent requirements of globalized service delivery, distinguishing between routine administrative overreach and genuine, role-specific operational emergencies (Dalal, 2026).

### SMEs and Cultural Barriers

India's deeply ingrained corporate culture presents a formidable psychological and sociological barrier to disconnection (Aman-Ullah et al., 2023). The widespread glorification of "hustle culture" where extreme working hours, presenteeism, and sleep deprivation are celebrated as proxies for dedication, loyalty, and ambition makes the practical exercise of the right to disconnect professionally perilous (Dalal, 2026). In an intensely competitive labor market characterized by high unemployment and job insecurity, employees fear that exercising their legal right to switch off will result in being labeled uncooperative, ultimately jeopardizing their performance appraisals, career progression, and job security (Dalal, 2026; Rana & Soodan, 2019). As seen



in Portugal and France, without a fundamental shift in management culture, workers may possess the legal right but lack the practical power to enforce it due to inherent workplace power dynamics (Dalal, 2026).

Furthermore, Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs), which form the backbone of the Indian economy and employ the vast majority of the workforce, often operate with razor-thin margins and limited personnel. Imposing a heavy regulatory compliance burden such as the mandatory establishment of formal Employees' Welfare Committees, the drafting of complex negotiation charters, and the looming threat of a 1% remuneration penalty could stifle SME growth, increase the cost of doing business, and inadvertently discourage formal hiring (Shubhi, 2025). This economic reality is why jurisdictions like Australia deliberately delayed the implementation of the right to disconnect for small businesses to allow for adaptation (Fair Work Act, 2024).

### VII. Conclusion and Policy Recommendations

The right to disconnect is fundamentally about preserving human agency and dignity in an era of boundless technological capability. Acknowledging that economic productivity cannot be sustained through widespread psychological depletion, the state must recognize rest as a biological necessity and a constitutional prerequisite under Article 21. To effectively operationalize this, policymakers should pursue a three-pronged approach.

First, rather than pursuing standalone legislation, the right to disconnect must be integrated into the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020. This requires broadening the statutory definition of workplace "hazards" to explicitly include psychosocial risks, tele pressure, and digital overwork, legally compelling employers to mitigate these dangers.

Second, a tiered regulatory framework is essential. Traditional domestic industries should adopt strict out-of-hours boundaries formalized through collective bargaining, akin to the French model. Conversely, IT

and global services should implement an "unreasonable refusal" paradigm modeled on Australia allowing demonstrably necessary, compensated after-hours engagement without stifling continuous global operations.

Finally, labor laws must mandate algorithmic transparency to protect gig economy workers. Digital platforms must be prohibited from using algorithms that penalize disconnection with reduced search visibility or task allocation. By adopting these measures, India can build a progressive labor framework that champions both economic competitiveness and workforce well-being.

\*\*\*\*\*

### References

- Aman-Ullah, A., Aziz, A., Ariza-Montes, A., & Han, H. (2023). Workplace tele pressure and innovative work performance: A moderation mediation study through work-family conflicts and job burnout. *Journal of Business Research*.
- Amandeep, A., & Gulati, P. (2020). Rapid technological advancements, changes in flexible work arrangements post-pandemic, and changes in India's work culture, driven by major reforms in labour law. *Journal of Industrial and Employee Relations*.
- Bandhua Mukti Morcha v. Union of India*, AIR 1984 SC 802 (Supreme Court of India). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/595099/>
- Boring, N. (2020). *Telework and the French right to disconnect*. Law Library of Congress. <https://blogs.loc.gov/law/2020/08/telework-and-the-french-right-to-disconnect/>
- Center for Applied Research in Data Science (CERAI). (2024). *Gig economy report*. Indian Institute of Technology Madras. (<https://cerai.iitm.ac.in/docs/Gig-Economy-Report-Final.pdf>)



- Code du travail [French Labor Code], Article L2242-17 (2016). (France). ([https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article\\_lc/LEGIARTI000033020193](https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/codes/article_lc/LEGIARTI000033020193))
- Constitution of India, art. 21. <https://www.india.gov.in/my-government/constitution-india>
- Constitutional Court of Colombia. (2023). *Ruling C-331 of 2023*. <https://www.corteconstitucional.gov.co/ingles/main-decisions>
- Dalal, A. (2026). *The Right to Disconnect Bill 2025 & international human rights law*. Oxford Human Rights Hub. <https://ohrh.law.ox.ac.uk/the-right-to-disconnect-bill-2025-international-human-rights-law/>
- Fair Work Act 2009 (Cth) s 333M (Austl.), as amended by the Fair Work Legislation Amendment (Closing Loopholes No. 2) Act 2024. <https://www.legislation.gov.au/C2004A03236/latest/text>
- Fair Work Commission. (2024). *Right to disconnect disputes*. Australian Government. <https://www.fwc.gov.au/workplace-disputes/other-workplace-disputes/right-disconnect-disputes/what-right-disconnect>
- Goh, J., Pfeffer, J., & Zenios, S. A. (2016). The relationship between workplace stressors and mortality and health costs in the United States. *Management Science*, 62(2), 608-628. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2014.2115>
- Gray, M. L., & Suri, S. (2019). *Ghost Work: How to Stop Silicon Valley from Building a New Global Underclass*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Hamid, A. (2024). The Right to Disconnect through the lens of the ILO's Decent Work Agenda. *Lex-Localis*.
- In Re: Ramlila Maidan Incident Dt. 4/5.06.2011 v. Home Secretary, Union of India*, (2012) 5 SCC 1 (Supreme Court of India). <https://indiankanoon.org/doc/17021567/>
- International Labour Organization (ILO). (2024). *Teleworking effects on mental health: A systematic review and a research agenda*. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 21(3), 243. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph21030243>
- Josserand, E. (2024). The right to disconnect: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Industrial Relations*, 66(5), 703-720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00221856241290625>
- Lee, C. J. (2016). Sleep as a human rights issue. *Sleep Health*, 2, 6-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sleh.2015.12.007>
- Ministry of Labour and Employment. (2020). *Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020*. Government of India. <https://dgtasli.gov.in/public/Admin/Cms/AllPdf/650059fbb8f1a9.98699174.pdf>
- NITI Aayog. (2022). *India's booming gig and platform economy*. Government of India. ([https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-06/25th\\_June\\_Final\\_Report\\_Eng.pdf](https://www.niti.gov.in/sites/default/files/2022-06/25th_June_Final_Report_Eng.pdf))
- Rahul, A., & Shaifali, D. (2025). Invisible Labor in Digital Age: Women and the Gig Economy. *International Journal of Engineering Technologies and Management Research*, 12(7), 28-40. <https://doi.org/10.29121/ijetmr.v12.i7.2025.1654>
- Rana, A., & Soodan, V. (2019). Effect of Occupational and Personal Stress on Job Satisfaction, Burnout, and Health: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of College Teachers in Punjab, India. *Indian Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, 23(3), 133-40.



Right to Disconnect Bill, Lok Sabha Bill No. 51 of 2025.

(India). (<https://sansad.in/getFile/BillsTexts/LSBillTexts/Asintroduced/51%20of%202025%20AS125202592416PM.pdf?source=legislation>)

Salehi, N., Irani, L. C., Bernstein, M. S., Alkhatib, A., Ogbe, E., & Kristric, K. (2015). We are Dina: Integrating crowdsourcing and participatory design. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1621-1630.

Santuzzi, A. M., & Barber, L. K. (2018). Workplace telepressure and worker well-being: The intervening role of psychological detachment. *Occupational Health Science*, 2(4), 337-363. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s41542-018-0022-8>

Schulte, P., Sauter, S., Tiesman, H., Pandalai, S., Chosewood, L. C., Pana-Cryan, R.,... & Reissman, D. (2024). Workplace psychosocial hazards. *National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH)*.

Seth, M. (2021). *Employee well-being trends and best practices in the Indian IT industry*. People Matters. <https://www.peplematters.in/article/wellness/employee-well-being-trends-and-best-practices-in-the-indian-it-industry-29640>

Shubhi. (2025, December 10). *Right to Disconnect Bill, 2025*. SCC Online. <https://www.sconline.com/blog/post/2025/12/10/right-to-disconnect-bill-2025/>

Tubaro, P., Casilli, A. A., & Coville, M. (2020). The trainer, the verifier, the imitator: Three ways in which human platform workers support artificial intelligence. *Big Data & Society*, 7(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951720919776>

van der Molen, H. F., Nieuwenhuijsen, K., Frings-Dresen, M. H. W., & de Groene, G. (2020). Work-related psychosocial risk factors for stress-related mental disorders: an updated systematic review and

meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*, 10(7), e034849. (<https://doi.org/10.1136/BMJOPEN-2019-034849>)

World Health Organization (WHO) & International Labour Organization (ILO). (2024). *Mental health at work: Policy brief*. [https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed\\_protect/@protrav/@safework/documents/publication/wcms\\_856976.pdf](https://www.ilo.org/sites/default/files/wcmsp5/groups/public/@ed_protect/@protrav/@safework/documents/publication/wcms_856976.pdf)

Yadav, K. (2020). Right to Sleep as a Fundamental Right: An Analysis vis-à-vis the Ramlila Maidan Case. *International Journal of Law Management & Humanities*.

Zuleta Martínez, D. (2023, November 20). *Colombia: Labor disconnection ruled a fundamental right*. DLA Piper/SHRM. <https://www.shrm.org/topics-tools/news/colombia-right-to-disconnect>