

GRC BULLETIN

APRIL - 2025, VOLUME: li

Case Law

Beyond Borders: Legal scrutiny of EPF rules for foreign workers

[Click Here to Read Full Bulletin](#)



JUDICIAL INSIGHT

Case Title

*[M/S. Reaero India
Private Limited vs. The
Union Of India (W.P.
No.18486/2012)]*

BEYOND BORDERS: LEGAL SCRUTINY OF EPF RULES FOR FOREIGN WORKERS

FACTS OF THE CASE

1. The Union of India, through a notification dated 01.10.2008, introduced:
 - Para 83 in the Employees Provident Fund (EPF) Scheme, 1952, and
 - Para 43A in the Employees Pension Scheme, 1995, extending EPF and pension contributions to international workers without any salary threshold.
2. Multiple writ petitions were filed by employers and employees, challenging the constitutional validity of these provisions, arguing that
 - It was arbitrary and violative of Article 14 of the Constitution.
 - It imposed disproportionate financial burdens on employers.
 - Indian workers earning above ₹15,000/month are excluded, but no such cap exists for international workers.
 - Many international workers are senior foreign employees or consultants who stay only temporarily, making them unsuitable for long-term schemes like EPF.
3. The Government defended the amendment, arguing it was:
 - Introduced to honor Social Security Agreements (SSAs) with other countries.
 - Designed to protect Indian workers posted abroad who otherwise lose contributions made in foreign countries.

An intelligible classification based on the reciprocity principle under SSAs.

Issues Before the Court

1. Whether Para 83 of the EPF Scheme and Para 43A of the Pension Scheme are unconstitutional as being arbitrary, unreasonable, and violative of Article 14?
2. Whether the absence of a salary ceiling for international workers results in hostile discrimination when compared to domestic employees?
3. Whether the classification of international workers under these provisions is based on reasonable differentia?



JUDICIAL INSIGHT

Case Title

[M/S. Recaero India Private Limited vs. The Union Of India (W.P. No.18486/2012)]

Supreme Court Verdict / High Court Observation

1. The Court did not find Para 83 and 43A to be unconstitutional.
2. It held that:
 - International workers form a separate class with specific legal and international obligations under bilateral SSAs.
 - The classification is valid and not arbitrary, fulfilling the test of intelligible differentia and rational nexus.
 - Article 14 applies to all persons, including foreign nationals, but in this case, the distinction made by law was reasonable.
 - The provisions serve a legitimate purpose—preventing loss of social security for Indian workers abroad and ensuring reciprocal treatment.

Hence, the challenge to the vires (validity) of Para 83 and Para 43A was dismissed.

CASE TITLE:

[M/S. Recaero India Private Limited vs. The Union Of India (W.P. No.18486/2012)]



Head Quarters:

Vasudha, 2nd Floor, No. 2, 38th Main Rd,
Rose Garden, JP Nagar Phase 6, J. P. Nagar,
Bengaluru, Karnataka 560078

Ph: 080 41673023

Email: info@ricago.com

Website: www.ricago.com

Subscribe to the Newsletter:

Subscribe

Disclaimer: This newsletter is prepared by Clonect Solutions Pvt. Ltd. and contains information about the statutory compliance updates for general information only. No claim is made as to warrant or represent that the information contained in this document is correct. Also, it should not be considered as legal or financial advice and under no circumstances Clonect Solutions Pvt. Ltd. shall be held responsible for any kind of damages arising there to.

#Trusted Compliance Partner