INDIALAW



LABOUR

The Orissa High Court Upholds Maternity Benefits for Contract Employees

AUTHOR Nidhi Singh, Rahul Sundaram

PUBLISHED 2 July 2025

In a significant ruling, the Orissa High Court has reaffirmed the rights of contract employees to maternity benefits. The case, which involved an appeal against a single judge's order, highlights the ongoing struggle for equitable treatment of all female employees, regardless of their employment status. This article examines the details of the case, the legal arguments presented, and the court's comprehensive analysis leading to its final decision.

Background of the Case

The case originated when Smt. Anindita Mishra, a contract employee with the Health & Family Welfare Department, sought maternity leave benefits under the extant State Policy. Despite producing a medical certificate, her application was rejected by the second appellant without any stated reason. This led to the filing of a Writ Petition (WPC(OAC) No. 1680 of 2017) in the Orissa High Court, challenging the denial of maternity benefits. The appellants, the State of Odisha and another, contested the respondent's claim, arguing that maternity benefits were not applicable to contract employees.

The Single Judge's Decision

The single judge of the Orissa High Court ruled in favor of the respondent, directing that she be granted maternity leave benefits. The judge's order was grounded in the principle that maternity benefits should be available to all female employees, including those on contract, as part of the State's socio-welfare obligations. This decision was based on the broader interpretation of the State Policy and the importance of maternity leave in promoting the well-being of both the mother and the child.

Rival Contentions

The appellants argued that the right to maternity benefits was strictly governed by the State Policy and that the respondent, being a contract employee, did not fall within the scope of this policy. They contended that the decision of the writ court should have been set aside and the matter remanded for fresh consideration. The appellants further argued that the respondent's entitlement to maternity benefits was not properly adjudged by the single judge.

On the other hand, the respondent claimed that maternity benefits should be available to all female employees, including those on contract, as a matter of right under the State Policy and international conventions. She argued that the denial of maternity benefits based on the nature of employment is discriminatory and violates the principles of equality and human rights.

Legal Provisions and Judgments Relied Upon

The court referred to several international conventions, including Article 10(2) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and Article 11(2)(b) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW), which emphasize the importance of maternity leave and its social significance. The court also cited the Maternity Benefit Act, 1961, which provides for maternity benefits to female employees.

The court relied on several Supreme Court judgments, including Bhupendra Nath Hazarika v. State of Assam, which emphasized the government's role as a model employer, and Mohinder Singh Gill v. Chief Election Commissioner, which highlighted the necessity of providing reasons for decisions in good governance. The court also cited Dr. Kabita Yadav v. Secretary, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare Department, which established that even contractual employees are entitled to maternity benefits.

Court's Analysis

The court emphasized that maternity leave is a fundamental right for both the mother and the child, promoting bonding and well-being. It highlighted that the State Policy should be construed liberally to advance its objectives, especially in the context of a welfare state. The court dismissed the appellants argument that the respondent's claim did not fall within the State Policy, noting that the policy should apply to all female employees, regardless of their employment status. The court also rejected the argument that the matter should be remanded for fresh consideration, stating that the issue was a question of law that could be resolved by the court.

Final Decision

The Orissa High Court upheld the single judge's order, rejecting the appeal on the grounds that it was devoid of merits. The court directed that the impugned order be implemented and that a compliance report be filed within eight weeks. The judgment emphasized the importance of maternity benefits as a socio-welfare measure and the State's obligation to provide such benefits to all female employees, including those on contract.

Conclusion

The Orissa High Court's ruling in this case is a significant step forward in ensuring that all female employees, regardless of their employment status, have access to maternity benefits. This judgment shows the need for interpreting State Policies liberally to advance socio-welfare objectives and uphold the principles of equality and human rights. As India continues to strive for gender equality and social justice, this decision is a reminder of the critical role that the judiciary plays in protecting the rights of marginalized workers.

For further details write to contact@indialaw.in

Related Practice Areas

Labour And Employment