AILET

# Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board Vs. A. Rajappa: A Critical Analysis

Adtiya Aryan · 27 Oct 2025

## Introduction

The Supreme Court of India's decision in *Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board v. A. Rajappa* (1978 AIR 548) stands as a monumental landmark in Indian labor jurisprudence, fundamentally restructuring the definition of "industry" under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (IDA).

This judgment was necessitated by decades of judicial inconsistency regarding the statutory scope of the Act, ultimately leading a seven-judge Constitution Bench to articulate a definitive, functional framework known as the Triple Test.

## Facts

The Appellant in the case was the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB), a statutory body entrusted with the essential public function of providing water and sanitation amenities to the citizens of Bangalore.

The dispute arose when the BWSSB imposed fines on its employees (the Respondents, led by A. Rajappa) for various instances of alleged misconduct, and subsequently recovered these penalties.

The employees, dissatisfied with the disciplinary actions, initiated claims applications under Section 33C(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, arguing that the fines imposed transgressed the principles of natural justice and demanded redressal.

## The Preliminary Jurisdictional Challenge

The Appellant Board raised a fundamental preliminary objection before the Labour Court, arguing that the Labour Court lacked jurisdiction to entertain the claims.

The BWSSB contended that, as a statutory body performing what it claimed was “in essence a regal function by providing the basic amenities to the citizens,” it could not be classified as an “industry” under Section 2(j) of the IDA. If the Board was not an industry, its employees were not “workmen” protected by the Act.

This objection was initially overruled by the Labour Court, which ruled in favour of the employees. The BWSSB then filed two Writ Petitions before the Karnataka High Court, continuing to argue its immunity from industrial classification.

The Division Bench of the High Court dismissed the Board’s petitions, affirming that the BWSSB indeed fell under the definition of an “industry” as articulated in the Act. This judicial trajectory culminated in the appeal before the Supreme Court.

## Legal Issue

The central and singular issue before the Supreme Court was to establish the definitive legal test for interpreting the word “Industry” under Section 2(j) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, thereby resolving the intractable conflict between existing precedents and determining the scope of protection afforded to public sector employees.

This case was pivotal because it directly challenged the notion of State immunity when providing essential public welfare services. If the BWSSB had succeeded in its argument that providing water supply was a purely ‘regal function’, a massive array of government-run enterprises offering essential services (such as electricity generation, public transport, and municipal sanitation) could have claimed similar immunity, severely curtailing labour rights in the public sector.

By dismissing the objection based on the performance of a public amenity, the Supreme Court determined that in a modern welfare state, the organized provision of essential services, even if monopolized by the State, constitutes an organized undertaking functionally analogous to a commercial one, thereby stripping welfare activities of their automatic sovereign immunity cloak in labour relations.

## Defining the “Triple Test”

The seven-judge bench, delivering its majority opinion through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, laid down the foundational legal criterion for determining industrial classification: the functional

Triple Test. This test shifted the judicial inquiry from the form, motive, or identity of the employer to the objective, systematic nature of the organizational activity itself.

The Court fundamentally rejected pre-existing restrictive interpretations tied to concepts like “profit motive” or “trade.” Instead, it adopted a functionalist approach, holding that the crucial criterion for determining classification is the inherent nature of the organized activity, focusing particularly on the relationship between employer and employee.

The presence of organized activities possessing the three defined elements may qualify the body as an “industry,” even if the activities are not strictly considered traditional trade or business ventures.

1. Element One: Systematic Activity (Continuity and Organization)

The first component requires that the activity demonstrate structural continuity and organization. The court stipulated that an industry is characterized by “a continuity, is an organized activity, is a purposeful pursuit – not an isolated adventure, desultory excursion or casual, fleeting engagement motivelessly undertaken”.

This criterion ensures that only structured, regular, and planned undertakings, such as complex public works or ongoing service provision, are included, while temporary, purely administrative, or intermittent governmental tasks lacking continuous structure are excluded.

1. Element Two: Co-operation between Employer and Employee

The second element emphasizes the indispensable human relationship. An “industry” cannot exist without a shared “co-operative endeavour” between the two principal wings: those who manage and organize the venture (employers) and those who execute the manual or technical work (employees/workmen).

This collaboration establishes the essential functional nexus—the relationship between the two sides—that forms the necessary basis for initiating and resolving industrial disputes under the IDA. Without this defined relationship, the Act’s framework is rendered inapplicable.

1. Element Three: Production of Material Goods or Services (Economic Utilities)

The final, defining element broadened the concept of economic activity significantly. The activity must be “geared to utilities in which the community has concern,” specifically generating “economic utilities—material goods or services to satisfy human wants or wishes”.

By explicitly including ‘services,’ the Court ensured that public amenity providers (like water supply), sanitation, and service sectors like education were fully covered, even where the output did not involve tangible, manufactured goods. The inquiry centers on the organized satisfaction of generalized human wants.

The enduring power of the Triple Test lies in its ability to be universally applied across disparate sectors by focusing solely on objective structure and function.

By establishing the three elements as conjunctive requirements, the Court set a high but clear threshold: if an organizational activity possesses systematic structure, involves cooperative labor relations, and produces a community utility, it is legally defined as an industry, regardless of its original incorporation charter.

This functional approach maximized the protective umbrella of the IDA over the majority of the working population, moving decisively away from archaic definitions tied only to manufacturing or traditional trade.

## Critical Evaluation of the Triple Test in the Modern Indian Economy

The Triple Test, designed for the socio-economic context of the 1970s, remains fundamentally robust due to its focus on *function* rather than *form*. This functional approach is theoretically well-suited for a highly diversified, globalized service economy where traditional definitions of “manufacture” are obsolete.

Nonetheless, the difficulty of separating “public service” from “organized activity,” particularly in governmental welfare initiatives, has exposed the weakness of the ‘Dominant Nature Test.’

Activities like ‘Social Forestry’ blur the line between core State functions and industrial undertakings, causing conflicting judicial rulings. The complexity of applying a single, functional test to hybrid governmental organizations necessitates a structural refinement.

## Anticipating the Nine-Judge Verdict

The pending reference to the nine-judge bench presents the Supreme Court with the opportunity to either confirm the stability of the functional test or introduce structural limitations.

If the Court upholds *Rajappa*, it will maintain consistency, reinforce broad labour protections, and uphold the expansive socio-economic purpose of the IDA. Conversely, arguments for overturning or modifying *Rajappa* centre on the need to address the practical problems caused by the legislative failure of 1982.

A modification is likely to establish clear, statutory-like judicial exclusions for essential, non-commercial core government functions, large educational bodies, and genuine non-profit hospitals, thereby injecting boundaries that the legislature failed to establish.

The outcome will inevitably redefine the social contract between the Indian State and its vast public sector workforce for the coming generation.