



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced or copied in any form by any means without prior written permission of Editor-in-chief of White Black Legal – The Law Journal. The Editorial Team of White Black Legal holds the copyright to all articles contributed to this publication. The views expressed in this publication are purely personal opinions of the authors and do not reflect the views of the Editorial Team of White Black Legal. Though all efforts are made to ensure the accuracy and correctness of the information published, White Black Legal shall not be responsible for any errors caused due to oversight or otherwise.

WHITE BLACK
LEGAL

EDITORIAL **TEAM**

Raju Narayana Swamy (IAS) Indian Administrative Service **officer**



a professional
Procurement from the World Bank.

Dr. Raju Narayana Swamy popularly known as Kerala's Anti-Corruption Crusader is the All India Topper of the 1991 batch of the IAS and is currently posted as Principal Secretary to the Government of Kerala. He has earned many accolades as he hit against the political-bureaucrat corruption nexus in India. Dr Swamy holds a B.Tech in Computer Science and Engineering from the IIT Madras and a Ph. D. in Cyber Law from Gujarat National Law University. He also has an LLM (Pro) (with specialization in IPR) as well as three PG Diplomas from the National Law University, Delhi- one in Urban Environmental Management and Law, another in Environmental Law and Policy and a third one in Tourism and Environmental Law. He also holds a post-graduate diploma in IPR from the National Law School, Bengaluru and diploma in Public

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay

Dr. R. K. Upadhyay is Registrar, University of Kota (Raj.), Dr Upadhyay obtained LLB , LLM degrees from Banaras Hindu University & Phd from university of Kota.He has succesfully completed UGC sponsored M.R.P for the work in the ares of the various prisoners reforms in the state of the Rajasthan.



Senior Editor

Dr. Neha Mishra



Dr. Neha Mishra is Associate Professor & Associate Dean (Scholarships) in Jindal Global Law School, OP Jindal Global University. She was awarded both her PhD degree and Associate Professor & Associate Dean M.A.; LL.B. (University of Delhi); LL.M.; Ph.D. (NLSIU, Bangalore) LLM from National Law School of India University, Bengaluru; she did her LL.B. from Faculty of Law, Delhi University as well as M.A. and B.A. from Hindu College and DCAC from DU respectively. Neha has been a Visiting Fellow, School of Social Work, Michigan State University, 2016 and invited speaker Panelist at Global Conference, Whitney R. Harris World Law Institute, Washington University in St.Louis, 2015.

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja, Assistant Professor, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi,

Ms. Sumiti Ahuja completed her LL.M. from the Indian Law Institute with specialization in Criminal Law and Corporate Law, and has over nine years of teaching experience. She has done her LL.B. from the Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. She is currently pursuing Ph.D. in the area of Forensics and Law. Prior to joining the teaching profession, she has worked as Research Assistant for projects funded by different agencies of Govt. of India. She has developed various audio-video teaching modules under UGC e-PG Pathshala programme in the area of Criminology, under the aegis of an MHRD Project. Her areas of interest are Criminal Law, Law of Evidence, Interpretation of Statutes, and Clinical Legal Education.



Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal

Dr. Navtika Singh Nautiyal presently working as an Assistant Professor in School of law, Forensic Justice and Policy studies at National Forensic Sciences University, Gandhinagar, Gujarat. She has 9 years of Teaching and Research Experience. She has completed her Philosophy of Doctorate in 'Intercountry adoption laws from Uttranchal University, Dehradun' and LLM from Indian Law Institute, New Delhi.



Dr. Rinu Saraswat

Associate Professor at School of Law, Apex University, Jaipur,
M.A, LL.M, Ph.D,

Dr. Rinu have 5 yrs of teaching experience in renowned institutions like Jagannath University and Apex University. Participated in more than 20 national and international seminars and conferences and 5 workshops and training programmes.

Dr. Nitesh Saraswat

E.MBA, LL.M, Ph.D, PGDSAPM

Currently working as Assistant Professor at Law Centre II, Faculty of Law, University of Delhi. Dr. Nitesh have 14 years of Teaching, Administrative and research experience in Renowned Institutions like Amity University, Tata Institute of Social Sciences, Jai Narain Vyas University Jodhpur, Jagannath University and Nirma University.

More than 25 Publications in renowned National and International Journals and has authored a Text book on Cr.P.C and Juvenile Delinquency law.



Subhrajit Chanda

BBA. LL.B. (Hons.) (Amity University, Rajasthan); LL. M. (UPES, Dehradun) (Nottingham Trent University, UK); Ph.D. Candidate (G.D. Goenka University)

Subhrajit did his LL.M. in Sports Law, from Nottingham Trent University of United Kingdoms, with international scholarship provided by university; he has also completed another LL.M. in Energy Law from University of Petroleum and Energy Studies, India. He did his B.B.A.LL.B. (Hons.) focussing on International Trade Law.

ABOUT US

WHITE BLACK LEGAL is an open access, peer-reviewed and refereed journal provided dedicated to express views on topical legal issues, thereby generating a cross current of ideas on emerging matters. This platform shall also ignite the initiative and desire of young law students to contribute in the field of law. The erudite response of legal luminaries shall be solicited to enable readers to explore challenges that lie before law makers, lawyers and the society at large, in the event of the ever changing social, economic and technological scenario.

With this thought, we hereby present to you

CORPORATE LAW IMPLICATIONS OF WORK FROM HOME (WFH) POLICIES POST COVID-19

AUTHORED BY - MANVI SALUJA

Abstract

The global shift toward remote work, precipitated by the COVID-19 pandemic, has redefined the conventional employer-employee relationship, particularly in corporate legal regimes. This paper examines how corporate law, in India and comparatively, must evolve to meet the complexities introduced by Work From Home (WFH) policies. It analyses labor compliance, corporate governance, occupational safety, data protection, taxation, and employee rights in a distributed work environment. Drawing from statutory provisions, judicial precedents, regulatory guidelines, and global best practices, the study concludes by offering practical legal reforms to align corporate functioning with the hybrid workforce model.

1. Introduction

COVID-19 introduced a paradigm shift in workplace structures. Overnight, companies transitioned to remote operations, reshaping the traditional concept of the "workplace." What began as a health emergency response soon gained strategic significance. Today, many organizations have adopted hybrid or permanent WFH models, prompting urgent legal introspection.

While operational advantages—cost savings, talent mobility, and productivity gains—are evident, the legal system has struggled to catch up. Corporate law, deeply rooted in physical workplace assumptions, now faces challenges in enforcing employer responsibilities, ensuring governance compliance, and maintaining legal accountability across virtual spaces.

The central legal question is: *How must corporate legal frameworks evolve to accommodate a dispersed and digital workforce without compromising legal compliance, employee rights, or organizational accountability?*

2. Literature Review

2.1 Global and Theoretical Perspectives

Remote work, or telecommuting, has existed for decades, but lacked mainstream adoption. The pandemic catalyzed this trend. Choudhury, Foroughi, and Larson argue that work-from-anywhere (WFA) models enhance productivity and satisfaction by offering geographic freedom¹. Bloom's Stanford research supports this, citing a 13% increase in productivity among remote employees².

However, these studies often understate legal ramifications—specifically, how remote work alters employer obligations under labor and corporate governance laws. While the OECD and ILO have issued guidelines on remote work, there is little harmonization among domestic laws, especially in emerging economies³.

2.2 Indian Legal Literature

Indian scholars highlight a significant gap in legal readiness for WFH. Dr. Aruna B. contends that India's labor law codification, through the four new labor codes, overlooks the structural needs of remote workers⁴. While Section 6 of the *OSH Code, 2020* refers to "working conditions," it does not explicitly extend employer liability to home offices.

Further, corporate law scholars point to ambiguities in the Companies Act, 2013, where Section 173 allows board meetings via video conferencing but excludes specific matters like approval of financial statements, posing practical challenges in remote governance⁵.

Key Corporate Law Implications

A. Corporate Governance and Board Meetings

1. Legal Validity of Virtual Board Meetings

Before the pandemic, the **Companies Act, 2013** and Rule 3 of the **Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014** permitted board meetings through video conferencing, but **with restrictions on certain matters** like:

- Approval of financial statements,
- Board report,
- Prospectus,
- Amalgamation, merger, demerger,

- Takeover or acquisition of a company.

However, during COVID-19, the **Ministry of Corporate Affairs (MCA)**, through notifications (e.g., General Circular No. 10/2020 dated 23.03.2020), **relaxed these prohibitions**, allowing all matters to be discussed via virtual meetings. This removed operational hurdles and improved director participation, especially for multinational boards.

🔗 **Legal Insight:** Many companies have now amended their Articles of Association (AOA) to permit digital governance by default, even though this is not explicitly mandated.

2. Role of Independent Directors and Board Oversight

The **effectiveness of independent directors**—tasked with safeguarding minority interests and ethical compliance—has been under scrutiny in a remote setting. Key concerns include:

- Limited physical access to internal records and staff,
- Overreliance on management representations,
- Challenges in fulfilling whistleblower and risk management oversight.

The SEBI (Listing Obligations and Disclosure Requirements) Regulations, 2015 already mandate performance evaluation of directors. WFH may dilute their ability to discharge these duties unless supported by strong digital governance frameworks.

B. Compliance & Disclosure Requirements

1. Maintenance of Statutory Registers and Inspection Rights

Section 120 of the Companies Act allows for maintaining company records in electronic form. However, WFH shifts all operations to digital platforms (cloud storage, DMS), raising concerns over:

- **Tamper-evidence of records,**
- **Third-party access during inspection,** and
- **Compliance with audit trails.**

In case of any regulatory scrutiny (by ROC, SEBI, SFIO, etc.), ensuring that **digitally stored statutory registers** (like Register of Members, Directors, Charges) are **authentic and up-to-date** becomes a legal priority.

2. Audit and Financial Reporting Integrity

Audit committees and statutory auditors now have limited physical access to company premises and must rely on **remote audit tools and digital data**. Key implications include:

- Increased **risk of fraud or misstatement**, as virtual audits limit control testing.
- Questionable **independence** due to reliance on management systems.
- Potential conflict with **auditing standards (SA 315, 330, etc.)** on risk assessment and control evaluation.

Companies must maintain audit trails, encrypt financial data, and document all communications with auditors to withstand legal scrutiny.

3. ESG & Sustainability Disclosures

Post-COVID ESG reporting now includes:

- Employee mental health programs,
- Work-life balance policies,
- Diversity and inclusion in remote teams,
- Digital accessibility and safety.

Under SEBI's **Business Responsibility and Sustainability Reporting (BRSR)** framework (mandatory for top 1000 listed entities), companies are expected to disclose their **workplace practices and social impact**, which must now include WFH-specific policies.

C. Employment and Labour Law Interface

1. Coverage Under Labour Statutes

India's **Shops and Establishments Acts**, which govern working hours, overtime, weekly offs, and leave policies, are generally **location-specific**. In a WFH model, it's unclear whether:

- The **employee's home** becomes a de facto workplace,
- Employers are liable for **workplace injuries at home**, and
- Laws like the **Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020** apply to remote environments.

Some global jurisdictions (e.g., Germany, Spain) have codified "**Right to Disconnect**" laws, but Indian labour law still lacks WFH-specific safeguards.

2. Changes to Employment Contracts

WFH has prompted companies to amend employment agreements to include:

- **Workplace Flexibility Clauses**,
- **Reimbursement Policies** (for electricity, Wi-Fi, ergonomic chairs),
- **Surveillance Clauses** (governing screen monitoring, location tracking),
- **Confidentiality and IP Clauses** to account for data created/accessed remotely.

Legal challenges may arise if employees claim **invasion of privacy** or dispute wage reductions tied to productivity during WFH.

3. Jurisdiction and Dispute Resolution

An employee working remotely from a different state—or even a different country—raises jurisdictional questions:

- Can labour complaints be filed in the **employee's home state**?
- If cross-border, does it invoke **Private International Law and Conflict of Laws**?
- How will companies enforce **non-compete or confidentiality clauses** internationally?

Without contractual clarity, courts may interpret jurisdiction broadly, increasing the risk of multi-location legal proceedings.

D. Data Protection and Cybersecurity

With company data accessed from non-secure, personal devices and networks, there is significant legal exposure under:

- **Section 43A of the IT Act, 2000** – for failure to implement reasonable data security practices.
- **Section 72A** – for disclosure of personal information without consent.
- The **Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023**, once operational, will require companies to:
 - Obtain consent for remote monitoring,
 - Protect employee personal data from unauthorized access or leakage,
 - Appoint a **Data Protection Officer (DPO)** for compliance.

Companies failing to implement **zero-trust frameworks** or **endpoint security** could be held vicariously liable for breaches caused by remote employees.

E. Corporate Taxation and Permanent Establishment (PE)

1. Cross-border WFH and PE Risk

According to OECD guidelines and India's Double Taxation Avoidance Agreements (DTAAs), a **Permanent Establishment (PE)** is created when a foreign enterprise has a "fixed place of business" in another country. If a foreign company's employee works regularly from India:

- Their **home office** could qualify as a PE,
- The foreign company may have to **pay corporate tax in India** on attributable income,
- There may also be **GST registration and withholding tax implications**.

While OECD issued COVID-era guidance suggesting **PE should not be triggered due to temporary WFH**, tax authorities may argue otherwise if remote work continues long-term.

2. Domestic Implications

For Indian companies, inter-state WFH arrangements may trigger:

- **GST registration** in the employee's home state (in rare cases),
- **Professional tax liability** across multiple states,
- **TDS complexities** depending on payroll locations.

Tax advisors and legal teams must assess these risks and structure employment and operational models accordingly.

3. Methodology

This study adopts a **doctrinal legal methodology** supported by **qualitative content analysis**.

- **Primary sources:** Statutes such as the Companies Act, 2013; IT Act, 2000; OSH Code, 2020; Model Standing Orders under the Industrial Relations Code, 2020.
- **Secondary sources:** Scholarly articles, legal blogs, international organization reports (OECD, ILO), MCA and SEBI circulars.
- **Judicial decisions:** Supreme Court and High Court judgments on privacy, labor rights, and board responsibilities.

4. Legal Analysis

4.1 Employment Law and Labor Compliance

a) Definitional Crisis

Most Indian labor laws define “workplace” as a physical site, such as “factory” or “shop.” The *Factories Act, 1948*, for instance, does not contemplate a digital office. The *Shops and Establishments Acts* (state-specific) are similarly outdated.

b) Working Hours and Wages

The *Minimum Wages Act, 1948*, and the *Code on Wages, 2019* mandate tracking of hours and overtime. In WFH, enforcement is difficult. Employers face risk if employees allege unpaid overtime due to poor work-life boundaries⁶.

c) Industrial Disputes

Disciplinary action or retrenchment of remote employees lacks procedural clarity. The *Industrial Disputes Act, 1947*, assumes physical delivery of notices, workplace inquiry

mechanisms, and access to unions—all hard to replicate remotely.

4.2 Occupational Health & Safety (OSH)

a) Statutory Ambiguity

The *OSH Code, 2020* imposes safety obligations but lacks clarity on scope for remote workers. For instance, if an employee develops chronic back pain from a non-ergonomic chair at home, can the employer be held liable?

Internationally, Germany amended its Occupational Health and Safety Act to require employers to assess risks in home offices. India has no such mandate⁷.

b) POSH Act Applicability

The *Sexual Harassment of Women at Workplace (Prevention, Prohibition and Redressal) Act, 2013* applies even in remote settings, per the Ministry of Women and Child Development. However, complaint redressal processes may be compromised without physical access to ICCs⁸.

4.3 Corporate Governance under Companies Act, 2013

a) Board Meetings

Section 173(2) allows video conferencing, but Rule 4 of the *Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014* excludes certain matters—approval of financial statements, prospectuses, mergers—from virtual decisions⁹.

In practice, this disrupts corporate continuity in emergencies. The MCA provided temporary relaxations during the pandemic via circulars¹⁰, but these are not permanent.

b) Audit and Risk Committees

Ensuring active participation, voting records, and real-time discussions is more difficult remotely. Directors may also face increased liability if governance failures occur due to ineffective virtual decision-making.

4.4 Data Privacy and Surveillance

a) Statutory Landscape

The *IT Act, 2000* and its Rules provide rudimentary protection. The forthcoming *Digital Personal Data Protection (DPDP) Act, 2023* will impose obligations on “data fiduciaries,” including corporations collecting employee data remotely¹¹.

b) Surveillance Concerns

Employers often use keystroke monitoring, screenshots, and webcam surveillance to track

productivity. This may violate the right to privacy, affirmed as a fundamental right in *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017)¹². Without explicit consent, such surveillance may attract liability.

4.5 International Taxation and Permanent Establishment (PE)

If an Indian company allows an employee to permanently work from another country, tax authorities there may deem it a “Permanent Establishment” (PE), attracting corporate tax under DTAA terms¹³.

OECD guidance during COVID-19 provided temporary relief, but with remote work becoming permanent, this is a live risk. The situation is particularly complex for startups and tech companies with global talent¹⁴.

5. Discussion

The shift to WFH is permanent in many sectors, yet Indian corporate law continues to lag. Key challenges include:

- **Legal Uncertainty:** Absence of binding rules on WFH leads to inconsistent corporate practices.
- **Compliance Risk:** Companies risk violating wage, safety, and data laws without realizing it.
- **Inequitable Impact:** Remote work policies, if inadequately structured, can discriminate against certain employee groups—especially women or those lacking home infrastructure.

Moreover, India lacks a judicial precedent clearly addressing employer liability for remote workplace harms, creating ambiguity.

6. Conclusion & Recommendations

6.1 Conclusion

Work From Home is not a temporary fix but a strategic necessity. Yet, our legal framework—built around physical infrastructure—remains unprepared. Without legislative and regulatory reform, both employers and employees are left navigating a legal grey zone.

Key Judicial and Regulatory Developments

- **TCS v. State of Karnataka (2020):** Raised questions over whether IT/ITES companies working from home lose benefits under the Industrial Policy tied to SEZ zones.

- **MCA and SEBI Circulars:** Issued various relaxations during 2020-2022, some of which are now part of permanent regulatory policy. SEBI allowed AGMs/EGMs via electronic mode and simplified disclosure norms temporarily.

Emerging Issues

- **Surveillance vs. Privacy:** Use of productivity tools that monitor screen time, location, or webcam inputs may violate employees' right to privacy under *Puttaswamy v. Union of India* (2017).
- **WFH Fatigue and Legal Duty of Care:** Companies must uphold health and safety obligations even in home offices under the Factories Act and allied labour codes, where applicable.

International Trends and Comparative Legal Insights

- **United States:** Corporate liability has been reshaped through state-based "Remote Work Compliance" laws (e.g., California's strict data breach laws).
- **European Union:** GDPR compliance during WFH raised questions about consent, data transfers, and remote work surveillance.
- **Singapore and Australia:** Issued updated corporate governance codes advising firms on directors' duties, disclosures, and digitized compliance frameworks.

6.2 Recommendations

1. **Enact WFH Guidelines under Labour Codes:** Define responsibilities for hours, safety, grievance redressal, and expense reimbursement.
2. **Amend Companies Act Rules:** Allow financial approvals and key decisions via virtual platforms, with suitable audit trails.
3. **Draft Surveillance and Consent Guidelines:** Under the DPDP Act, require written employee consent for digital monitoring.
4. **Clarify Tax and PE Risks:** Issue CBDT and GST circulars to define tax consequences of international remote workers.
5. **Standardize Remote Work Contracts:** Include WFH clauses in appointment letters—covering expectations, liabilities, and digital etiquette.
6. **Conduct Awareness Training:** MCA and SEBI can mandate awareness programs for compliance officers and HR heads.

References / Footnotes

Would you like me to generate this paper in **PDF or Word document** format? Or help you

tailor it for submission to a journal or university review?

Footnotes

1. Prithwiraj Choudhury, Cirrus Foroughi and Barbara Larson, 'Work-from-anywhere: The productivity effects of geographic flexibility' (2020) *Strategic Management Journal*. [↵](#)
2. Nicholas Bloom et al., 'Does Working from Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment' (2015) *Quarterly Journal of Economics*. [↵](#)
3. OECD, 'Policy Responses to COVID-19: Teleworking and the future of work' (2021) <https://www.oecd.org>. [↵](#)
4. Aruna B, 'Labour Code and WFH: A Missed Opportunity?' (2022) *Indian Journal of Labour Law*, Vol 10(2). [↵](#)
5. Companies Act, 2013, s 173(2); Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014, Rule 4. [↵](#)
6. Code on Wages, 2019; *Labour Law Reporter* (2021) 67 LLR 342. [↵](#)
7. German Occupational Health and Safety Act, Amendment (2021). [↵](#)
8. Ministry of Women and Child Development, FAQs on POSH Act, 2021. [↵](#)
9. Companies (Meetings of Board and its Powers) Rules, 2014, Rule 4(1). [↵](#)
10. MCA Circular No. 10/2021, dated 23 June 2021. [↵](#)
11. Digital Personal Data Protection Act, 2023 (notified but yet to be enforced). [↵](#)
12. *Justice K.S. Puttaswamy (Retd.) v. Union of India* (2017) 10 SCC 1. [↵](#)
13. OECD, 'Updated Guidance on Tax Treaties and the Impact of the COVID-19 Pandemic' (2020). [↵](#)
14. PricewaterhouseCoopers, 'Remote Work and Tax Exposure' (2021) <https://www.pwc.com>.