

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS



Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary
Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)*.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

**Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis.
All rights reserved.**

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

**AN ANALYSIS-BASED RESEARCH ON THE FREEDOM OF
ASSOCIATION AND TRADE UNION RIGHTS OF
GOVERNMENT SERVANTS: CONSTITUTIONAL
PERSPECTIVES, SERVICE CONDUCT RESTRICTIONS AND
JUDICIAL TRENDS IN INDIA**

AUTHORED BY - JAYA GANAPATHE P

2nd Year, III SEMESTER

SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE IN LAW, THE TAMIL NADU DR. AMBEDKAR LAW
UNIVERSITY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

S/NO	CHAPTERS
1.	ABSTRACT INTRODUCTION 1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1.3 AIM OF RESEARCH 1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY 1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS 1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY
2.	CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS OF ASSOCIATIONAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT 2.1 CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF COLLECTIVE ASSOCIATION 2.2 REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS ON ASSOCIATIONAL FREEDOM 2.3 STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR SERVICE REGULATION 2.4 PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS IN DISCIPLINARY ACTION 2.5 SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS FOR DISCIPLINED FORCES 2.6 INTEGRATED CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION

3.	FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND GOVERNMENT SERVANTS 3.1 MEANING AND SCOPE 3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES
4.	SERVICE CONDUCT RESTRICTIONS 4.1 NATURE OF CONDUCT RULES 4.2 CONSTITUTIONAL VALIDITY 4.3 RECOGNITION AND DERECOGNITION
5.	JUDICIAL EVOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION RIGHTS IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT 5.1 CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF PEACEFUL COLLECTIVE EXPRESSION 5.2 PROTECTION AGAINST ARBITRARY WITHDRAWAL OF ASSOCIATIONAL FREEDOM 5.3 LIMITS OF UNION POWER UNDER THE CONSTITUTION 5.4 INTERNAL AUTONOMY OF ASSOCIATIONS 5.5 CONSTITUTIONAL SCRUTINY OF SERVICE REGULATIONS 5.6 DISCIPLINE AND SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS IN POLICE SERVICES 5.7 RECOGNITION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE 5.8 JUDICIAL REJECTION OF STRIKE AS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT
6.	CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION ON THE RIGHT TO STRIKE 6.1 ABSENCE OF A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO STRIKE 6.2 REAFFIRMATION IN T.K. RANGARAJAN 6.3 CONSEQUENCES FOR GOVERNMENT SERVANTS 6.4 INTEGRATED LEGAL POSITION

7.	COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SERVANTS' ASSOCIATIONAL RIGHTS 7.1 UNITED KINGDOM: STATUTORY RECOGNITION WITH STRONG PUBLIC INTEREST CONTROLS 7.2 SOUTH AFRICA: STRONG CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF LABOUR RIGHTS 7.3 CANADA: BALANCED RIGHTS WITH ESSENTIAL-SERVICE REGULATION 7.4 COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT WITH INDIA 7.5 COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION
8.	CRITICAL RESEARCH ANALYSIS 8.1 CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE BETWEEN RIGHTS AND DISCIPLINE 8.2 WEAKNESS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FRAMEWORK 8.3 OVERBREADTH OF SERVICE CONDUCT RULES 8.4 NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL REFORM
9.	SUGGESTIONS
10.	CONCLUSION
11.	REFERENCES

AN ANALYSIS-BASED RESEARCH ON THE FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND TRADE UNION RIGHTS OF GOVERNMENT SERVANTS: CONSTITUTIONAL PERSPECTIVES, SERVICE CONDUCT RESTRICTIONS AND JUDICIAL TRENDS IN INDIA

Jaya Ganapathe¹

ABSTRACT

This research paper critically examines the constitutional and legal framework governing the freedom of association and trade union rights of government servants in India. It focuses on the interpretation of Article 19(1)(c) of the Constitution, the operation of service conduct restrictions, and the judicial approach to collective rights in public employment. The study argues that although Indian constitutional law recognizes the right of government servants to form associations or unions, it does not extend this protection to a fundamental right to strike. Through an analysis of constitutional provisions, landmark judicial decisions, and service law principles, the paper highlights the continuing tension between the demands of public administration and the autonomy of government employees. It further strengthens the discussion through a comparative study of the legal position in the United Kingdom, South Africa, and Canada, thereby showing how different constitutional systems balance collective labour rights with administrative discipline.

KEYWORDS

Freedom of association, government servants, trade union rights, Article 19(1)(c), service conduct rules, public employment, right to strike, constitutional law, judicial trends, comparative analysis.

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Freedom of association is one of the most important constitutional liberties in a democratic society, enabling individuals to unite for collective bargaining, representation, and social participation. Article 19(1)(c) guarantees this right to all citizens, including government servants, but because public service is governed by special conduct rules and the constitutional demands of neutrality and discipline, the right does not operate as it does in private

¹ Student of 2nd year LLM(Property law), The TN Dr. Ambedkar Law University, Taramani, Chennai-600-113.

employment. Government servants remain citizens with fundamental rights, yet reasonable restrictions are permitted in the interests of public order, administrative discipline, and uninterrupted service delivery. The judiciary has consistently protected the right to form associations while denying any fundamental right to strike, and has upheld service conduct rules where public interest and administrative continuity would otherwise be harmed.

1.2 STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The central problem this study addresses is the tension between constitutional freedom and administrative control: government servants should not be denied the right to associate and represent their collective concerns, yet the State must ensure discipline, neutrality, and continuity of public service — a tension that becomes acute when conduct rules are framed broadly enough to suppress legitimate association or treat all collective action as inherently unlawful.

1.3 AIM OF RESEARCH

This study analyses the constitutional position of government servants' freedom of association and trade union rights in India, focusing on service conduct restrictions and judicial trends, and compares India's approach with selected foreign jurisdictions to assess whether the current framework is balanced and constitutionally justifiable.

1.4 SCOPE OF THE STUDY

The study is confined to government servants and public employees governed by constitutional and statutory service rules, focusing on constitutional provisions, landmark cases, and comparative principles, and touches private-sector labour law only where it clarifies the public-private distinction.

1.5 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

What is the constitutional basis of freedom of association for government servants in India? How do service conduct rules regulate their trade union rights? What has been the judicial approach to strikes, demonstrations, and association rights? How does India compare with other constitutional systems?

1.6 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study follows a doctrinal, analytical, and comparative method, relying primarily on the

Constitution of India and judgments of the Supreme Court and High Courts, supported by legal commentary. The doctrinal method examines the governing principles, the analytical method assesses the balance between rights and discipline, and the comparative method evaluates similar issues in selected foreign jurisdictions.

CONSTITUTIONAL BASIS OF ASSOCIATIONAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

2.1 CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF COLLECTIVE ASSOCIATION

Article 19(1)(c) recognises the right to form associations or unions as a fundamental freedom extending to government servants as citizens; public employment does not erase an employee's constitutional personality, and a government servant retains the right to organise for lawful collective purposes such as representation, consultation, and redressal of service grievances. In **All India Bank Employees' Association v. National Industrial Tribunal** (AIR 1962 SC 171), the Supreme Court held that the right to form a union does not automatically include every trade union demand, particularly collective bargaining or strike, distinguishing a union's creation from the powers it may exercise. In **Damyanti Naranga v. Union of India** ((1971) 3 SCR 840), the Court held that this right includes continuing the association with the membership and identity chosen by its founders, protecting its internal autonomy from indirect administrative interference.

2.2 REASONABLE RESTRICTIONS ON ASSOCIATIONAL FREEDOM

Article 19(1)(c) is not absolute: Article 19(4) permits reasonable restrictions in the interests of sovereignty, integrity, public order, and morality, which the State often invokes to restrict demonstrations, strikes, and other collective action. In **Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar** (AIR 1962 SC 1166), the Supreme Court held that a blanket prohibition on peaceful demonstration could not be sustained, since peaceful expression remains within constitutional liberty — though it also held that government servants have no fundamental right to strike. The Article 19(4) test is reasonableness: a restriction must serve a real public purpose, not mere administrative convenience, without destroying the essence of the freedom.

2.3 STATUTORY AUTHORITY FOR SERVICE REGULATION

Article 309 empowers the State to regulate recruitment and conditions of service, forming the basis for most service conduct rules on discipline, neutrality, and misconduct; public employment is thus a regulated relationship rather than an ordinary contract, though such rules

must still conform to Part III. In **B. Manmohan and Others v. State of Mysore** (AIR 1966 Mysore 261), the Court held that service rules are not immune from constitutional review merely because framed under service law authority.

2.4 PROCEDURAL SAFEGUARDS IN DISCIPLINARY ACTION

Article 311 gives civil servants procedural protection against arbitrary dismissal, removal, or reduction in rank: punishment cannot be imposed without fairness, notice, and a hearing, even where a valid rule has been violated. This matters particularly where discipline follows union activity or strike participation — the State may act, but the procedure must remain fair, so an employee is not punished merely because the conduct involved collective protest.

2.5 SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS FOR DISCIPLINED FORCES

Article 33 empowers Parliament to modify fundamental rights for the armed forces, police, and intelligence agencies, recognising their need for stricter discipline and command structure. In **Delhi Police Non-Gazetted Karmchari Sangh v. Union of India** ((1981) 1 SCC 246), the Supreme Court accepted that police personnel require strict discipline and upheld stronger limits on their associational rights, confirming Article 33 as a special exception to Article 19(1)(c).

2.6 INTEGRATED CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION

Read together, Articles 19(1)(c), 19(4), 309, 311, and 33 form the constitutional framework governing associational rights: association is protected, its internal autonomy safeguarded, service rules remain subject to constitutional scrutiny, and disciplined forces may validly be treated differently — but none of it extends to an unrestricted right to strike.

FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

3.1 MEANING AND SCOPE

Freedom of association means more than the formal right to create a group: it includes the right to organise, maintain the group's identity, pursue lawful objectives, and participate in collective representation. For government servants, this is important because service associations allow them to raise grievances regarding pay, promotion, transfers, workload, and administrative injustice.

3.2 CONSTITUTIONAL STATUS OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Government servants remain citizens with fundamental rights, but exercise them in the context of public office; courts have generally accepted that public servants must observe greater discipline because their duties affect the public directly, without holding that they lose Article 19 protection altogether. The legal significance of associational freedom for government servants lies in balancing two values — employee participation and administrative discipline — since denying association altogether would leave grievances unheard, while unrestricted industrial action could disrupt essential services; constitutional law therefore seeks a middle path.

SERVICE CONDUCT RESTRICTIONS

4.1 NATURE OF CONDUCT RULES

Service conduct rules regulate the behaviour of government servants and often prohibit strikes, demonstrations, political participation, and conduct unbecoming of public office, justified as necessary for discipline, impartiality, and administrative efficiency.

4.2 CONSTITUTIONAL VALIDITY

The validity of such rules depends on reasonableness and proportionality: a rule may regulate the manner of protest without violating Article 19, but if it wholly suppresses association or renders union activity meaningless, it may be unconstitutional.

4.3 RECOGNITION AND DERECOGNITION

Recognition of a service association — for bargaining or consultation — is often contested, but recognition is not itself a fundamental right. Even so, withdrawal of recognition cannot be used to destroy the underlying constitutional right to associate.

JUDICIAL EVOLUTION OF ASSOCIATION RIGHTS IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

5.1 CONSTITUTIONAL RECOGNITION OF PEACEFUL COLLECTIVE EXPRESSION

As discussed in Chapter 2, **Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar** was the first major constitutional statement protecting peaceful collective expression while denying a fundamental right to strike, drawing the lasting line between protected demonstration and unprotected work stoppage.

5.2 PROTECTION AGAINST ARBITRARY WITHDRAWAL OF ASSOCIATIONAL FREEDOM

In **O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph** (AIR 1963 SC 812), the Supreme Court struck down a rule requiring government servants to quit an association once its recognition was withdrawn, holding that associational freedom cannot depend entirely on the administration's will and does not disappear merely because recognition is withdrawn.

5.3 LIMITS OF UNION POWER UNDER THE CONSTITUTION

All India Bank Employees' Association, discussed in Chapter 2, prevented Article 19(1)(c) from being read too expansively by separating a union's constitutional existence from the legal force of its demands.

5.4 INTERNAL AUTONOMY OF ASSOCIATIONS

Damyanti Naranga, discussed in Chapter 2, similarly confirms that the Constitution protects an association's internal autonomy, so administrative interference cannot alter its essential character.

5.5 CONSTITUTIONAL SCRUTINY OF SERVICE REGULATIONS

B. Manmohan, discussed in Chapter 2, confirms that service rules made under statutory authority must still be tested for legality, reasonableness, and fairness before restricting associational freedom.

5.6 DISCIPLINE AND SPECIAL RESTRICTIONS IN POLICE SERVICES

Delhi Police Non-Gazetted Karmchari Sangh, discussed in Chapter 2, confirms that disciplined forces may face stronger restrictions given the discipline, hierarchy, and neutrality their duties demand.

5.7 RECOGNITION OF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS IN PUBLIC SERVICE

The Delhi High Court in **Central PWD Engineers Association v. Union of India** (2023:DHC:3622-DB) reaffirmed that government servants remain within Part III protection, and that Article 19(1)(c) applies even though official recognition of an association is not itself a fundamental right — separating the constitutional right to associate from the administrative act of recognition.

5.8 JUDICIAL REJECTION OF STRIKE AS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT

The Supreme Court in **T.K. Rangarajan v. Government of Tamil Nadu** (AIR 2003 SC 3032) delivered the most emphatic statement on strikes by government servants: arising from a mass strike by Tamil Nadu employees demanding service benefits, the Court upheld disciplinary action and held that government servants have no fundamental, statutory, moral, or equitable right to strike, to protect public welfare, essential services, and administrative discipline. It remains the leading precedent and the strongest barrier to claims of strike as a constitutional entitlement.

CONSTITUTIONAL POSITION ON THE RIGHT TO STRIKE

6.1 ABSENCE OF A FUNDAMENTAL RIGHT TO STRIKE

The settled position in India is that the right to strike is not fundamental for government servants: the judiciary has consistently held that collective work stoppage cannot be claimed under Article 19, since strikes may seriously disrupt administration and harm citizens who depend on government services. Government servants may organise and present grievances, but cannot claim a right to stop work as pressure.

6.2 REAFFIRMATION IN T.K. RANGARAJAN

T.K. Rangarajan v. Government of Tamil Nadu, discussed in Chapter 5, is the modern reaffirmation of this position: the Supreme Court held that a strike could not be defended as a constitutional right and upheld disciplinary action against striking employees, without treating their underlying grievances as irrelevant — only their method of protest was unacceptable.

6.3 CONSEQUENCES FOR GOVERNMENT SERVANTS

Government servants must therefore rely on lawful mechanisms — service rules, departmental remedies, tribunals, courts, and negotiation — rather than strike as a weapon. Their associational rights remain intact but do not extend to disruptive work stoppage; the law recognises collective voice, not collective stoppage, as a constitutional entitlement.

6.4 INTEGRATED LEGAL POSITION

Taken together, the cases in Chapter 5 show that government servants enjoy associational freedom but not unrestricted industrial leverage: the Constitution protects the right to associate, while letting the State regulate conduct and prohibit strikes where necessary — the settled constitutional balance in India.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC SERVANTS' ASSOCIATIONAL RIGHTS

7.1 UNITED KINGDOM: STATUTORY RECOGNITION WITH STRONG PUBLIC INTEREST CONTROLS

The UK's position rests not on a written constitution but on statute, common law, and human rights norms. **Article 11** of the European Convention on Human Rights protects freedom of association, including the right to form and join trade unions, extending to public employees subject to statutory regulation wherever public order, security, or essential services are concerned — especially in policing, defence, and prisons. In **Austin and Others v. United Kingdom** ((2012) 55 EHRR 14), the European Court of Human Rights confirmed that Article 11 rights may be limited where state interests and public safety demand restraint. The UK is thus more permissive than India on union membership, but regulates industrial action by statute rather than constitutional limits.

7.2 SOUTH AFRICA: STRONG CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTION OF LABOUR RIGHTS

South Africa's framework is far more rights-oriented: Section 23 of its 1996 Constitution guarantees fair labour practices, including the right to form and join trade unions and to strike, though still regulated in essential services where interruption would threaten life, health, or safety. In **South African Police Service v. Police and Prisons Civil Rights Union (POPCRU)** ((CCT 89/10) [2011] ZACC 21), the Constitutional Court affirmed that public employees do not lose constitutional labour rights merely because they serve the State — making South Africa one of the most employee-friendly comparative models.

7.3 CANADA: BALANCED RIGHTS WITH ESSENTIAL-SERVICE REGULATION

Canada takes a balanced approach: Section 2(d) of its Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects freedom of association, interpreted by the Supreme Court of Canada to include meaningful collective bargaining, including for public employees, subject to restriction in essential services. In **Saskatchewan Federation of Labour v. Saskatchewan** ([2015] 1 SCR 245), the Court held that the right to strike is constitutionally protected as essential to meaningful bargaining, while accepting that essential services may justify limits — a middle position between strong labour constitutionalism and public interest regulation.

7.4 COMPARATIVE ASSESSMENT WITH INDIA

India is more restrictive than the UK, South Africa, and Canada: Article 19(1)(c) protects the right to associate, but courts deny any fundamental right to strike, favouring discipline and continuity over collective autonomy. The UK regulates industrial action by statute; South Africa constitutionalises strike subject to essential-service limits; Canada recognises bargaining and strike rights on similar terms. Indian government servant unions thus have a narrower legal space, though this may be defended by the country's administrative complexity and the public impact of service disruption.

7.5 COMPARATIVE CONCLUSION

The comparison shows differing balances: the UK adopts a regulated association model, South Africa a rights-centred labour model, Canada a balanced bargaining model, and India a discipline-centred model. India's approach is the most restrictive on strike rights but the most protective of administrative continuity, and may still benefit from stronger consultative and grievance mechanisms to compensate for the absence of a strike right.

CRITICAL RESEARCH ANALYSIS

8.1 CONSTITUTIONAL BALANCE BETWEEN RIGHTS AND DISCIPLINE

The Indian framework reflects a deliberate compromise between the freedom to associate and the State's need for discipline: government servants may form associations, but not use collective pressure to disrupt essential administration. The difficulty is breadth — restrictions justified in essential services may become excessive if applied uniformly regardless of function, so a more nuanced approach would better reflect the diversity of public employment.

8.2 WEAKNESS IN COLLECTIVE BARGAINING FRAMEWORK

The main weakness is the absence of a strong statutory framework for collective bargaining: the law recognises the right to associate but provides no robust mechanism for negotiation with the State. With strikes unavailable and negotiation weak, the right to associate risks becoming symbolic unless backed by transparent recognition rules, structured consultation, and effective grievance redressal.

8.3 OVERBREADTH OF SERVICE CONDUCT RULES

Service conduct rules are sometimes drafted overbroadly, restricting peaceful association and legitimate representation under the guise of discipline. Courts have corrected this in cases like

Kameshwar Prasad and **O.K. Ghosh**, but judicial correction alone is insufficient; legislative and administrative reform would create clearer standards for employees and government alike.

8.4 NEED FOR INSTITUTIONAL REFORM

The system needs institutional strengthening rather than punitive control alone: government servants need reliable channels to negotiate with the administration, and if the State restricts strike action, it owes a corresponding duty to build effective alternatives. The problem is ultimately one of balance — denying strike rights without consultative structures breeds frustration, while a mature framework should give government servants a real collective voice alongside continuity of essential services.

SUGGESTIONS

The research suggests India should move toward a more coherent, balanced framework for regulating government servants' associational rights, through a comprehensive statutory scheme defining the scope of association, recognition, membership, representation, and permissible protest, since the present position remains fragmented across constitutional provisions, conduct rules, and judicial decisions. Recognition procedures should be transparent and objective, with fair appeal mechanisms, so associations are not left vulnerable to arbitrary discretion. Stronger institutional channels — service councils, consultative committees, mediation forums, and time-bound grievance redressal bodies — should give government servants real alternatives to strike, given the settled position in **T.K. Rangarajan** that no right to strike exists. Conduct rules should be periodically reviewed to stay proportionate, since overbroad restrictions can improperly interfere with peaceful association, as **Kameshwar Prasad** and **O.K. Ghosh** show. Distinctions should continue between ordinary civil servants and disciplined forces under Article 33, without extending those restrictions mechanically to all public employees. Courts should continue proportionality-based review so that discipline is preserved without extinguishing the substance of Article 19(1)(c), drawing on stronger comparative consultative traditions while retaining India's commitment to uninterrupted administration.

CONCLUSION

This study shows that the freedom of association and trade union rights of government servants in India occupy a constitutionally protected but tightly regulated space. Article 19(1)(c) guarantees the right to form associations, while Articles 19(4), 309, 311, and 33 let the State

impose reasonable restrictions, frame conduct rules, ensure procedural fairness, and maintain stricter discipline in sensitive services.

The case law — from **Kameshwar Prasad** and **O.K. Ghosh** to **All India Bank Employees' Association**, **Damyanti Naranga**, **B. Manmohan**, **Delhi Police Non-Gazetted Karmchari Sangh**, **Central PWD Engineers Association**, and **T.K. Rangarajan** — shows a consistent pattern: association is protected, strike is not. India is also more restrictive than the UK, South Africa, and Canada, though its model remains defensible given the needs of a large welfare State — and would be more effective with transparent recognition procedures, meaningful consultation, and stronger grievance redressal, giving government servants a real, dignified, lawful collective voice.

REFERENCES

1. Constitution of India, Articles 19, 21, 33, 309 and 311.
2. Kameshwar Prasad v. State of Bihar, AIR 1962 SC 1166.
3. O.K. Ghosh v. E.X. Joseph, AIR 1963 SC 812.
4. All India Bank Employees' Association v. National Industrial Tribunal, AIR 1962 SC 171.
5. Damyanti Naranga v. Union of India, AIR 1971 SC 966.
6. T.K. Rangarajan v. Government of Tamil Nadu, (2003) 6 SCC 581.
7. Central PWD Engineers Association v. Union of India, Delhi High Court, 2023.
8. Delhi Police Non-Gazetted Karmchari Sangh v. Union of India.
9. M.H. Devendrappa v. Karnataka State Small Industries Development Corporation.
10. Relevant academic writings on Article 19(1)(c), public employment, and service law.