ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

MEDIATION IN LABOUR AND INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES: A COMPARATIVE STUDY WITH ARBITRATION

V. Nithya Sri[1], A. K. Arivarasi[2], R. Archana[3]
[1]*BBA LLB (Hons), Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai – 603103*
[2]*BA LLB (Hons), Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai - 603103.*
[3]*BCOM LLB (Hons), Chettinad School of Law, Chettinad Academy of Research and Education, Kelambakkam, Chennai – 603103*

ABSTRACT
Industrial peace is crucial for economic growth, yet India continues to face persistent challenges in resolving labour and industrial disputes. This paper analyses the role of mediation in industrial dispute resolution through a comparative study with arbitration. Using doctrinal research and comparative analysis, it examines the legal provisions under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and the Mediation Act, 2023. Relevant case laws and global practices are also reviewed to provide a comprehensive perspective. The findings reveal that mediation is more effective in preserving long-term industrial relationships and reducing judicial backlog, while arbitration ensures enforceability and finality. However, both mechanisms have inherent limitations. The study recommends integrating mediation as a mandatory first step in labour disputes, supported by trained mediators and strong institutional frameworks. The analysis further underscores the need for a hybrid model in which mediation precedes arbitration, thereby striking a balance between cooperation and legal certainty.

KEYWORDS: *The Mediation Act, 2023, Judicial Backlog, Alternative Dispute Resolution, Industrial Peace, Labour Law.*

INTRODUCTION
For a long period in India, the Industrial Disputes Act provided solutions to industrial disputes, institutionalising the mechanisms of conciliation, arbitration, and adjudication. Unfortunately, due to the consistently increasing volumes of disputes, coupled with a nearly collapsing judiciary, a newer concept of Alternative Dispute Resolution is being adopted to manage disputes, with mediation and arbitration comprising the prime approaches. Following the promulgation of the Mediation Act, 2023, India formally recognised mediation as an independent and enforceable mechanism, which heralds a crucial change in turning toward consensual forms of dispute settlement.

Labour and industrial relations need a special approach wherein long-term relationships, trust, and cooperation should be maintained. Industrial disputes encompass emotional, social, and economic dimensions apart from contractual obligations, as compared to those disputes that concern commercial contracts. Thus, mediation could be said to contribute to a more humanistic and restorative method of dispute resolution compared to arbitration, which emphasises legal finality and binding results.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM
Even with the Industrial Dispute Act in place and the Industrial Relations Code functioning, India still holds a long backlog of industrial disputes awaiting redress in front of labour courts and tribunals. Very often, the formal adjudication system is accused of being very time-consuming, rigid, and adversarial in its process. Arbitration, being slightly faster, is, however, still embroiled in almost the same procedural complexities and expenses. Mediation, for its sake, is infrequently utilised in an industrial context due to a lack of institutional environment for mediation support, poorly trained professionals, and little awareness of the existing mediation facilities among trade unions and employers.

This study shall assess if mediation could be a more effective, relationship-preserving, and time-efficient method of solving industrial disputes than arbitration, and how both could be merged to the greater cause of industrial peace in India.

OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY
The main objectives of this study are:
- To retrace the historical development of mediation and arbitration in the context of labour disputes.
- To analyse the legal frameworks operating in India under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Industrial Relations Code, 2020, Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, and the Mediation Act, 2023.
- To compare the industrial dispute mediation process, scope of mediation, and outcome held versus arbitration.
- To highlight the merits and demerits of mediation as opposed to arbitration within the boundaries of Indian labour law.
- To analyse the case laws interpreting mediation and arbitration in industrial relations.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS
1. What are the merits of mediation over arbitration for settling disputes under the labour laws?
2. What are some of the disadvantages of mediation compared to arbitration in labour law disputes?

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

3. On what bases have Indian courts interpreted and applied mediation and arbitration in industrial disputes by way of case laws?
4. What role do mediators and arbitrators play in industrial disputes?
5. How does mediation help in reducing the backlog of justice in industrial matters?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is inherently doctrinal and comparative. It gathers statutory interpretation, judicial decisions, as well as scholarly exposition to analyse principles and practices of mediation and arbitration in India. Comparative references are made to the United Kingdom, the United States, and the International Labour Organisation's framework to ensure that best practices are understood globally. Secondary sources include books, journal articles, government reports and online legal databases.

LITERATURE REVIEW

https://ijlmh.com/paper/alternative-dispute-resolution-mechanisms-in-indias-labour-law-enforcement-system/?utm
The research "Alternative Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in India's Labour Law Enforcement System" emphasises that traditional labour adjudication in India is replete with delays and inefficiencies, requiring ADR measures such as mediation, conciliation, and arbitration as important alternatives. It reviews the literature on ADR and its benefits, such as cost-effectiveness, confidentiality, and preservation of relationships, while at the same time identifying the challenges that still exist, including lack of awareness, institutional weakness, and inadequately trained mediators. In conclusion, the study argues for ADR as a vital yet underutilised tool for improving industrial justice in India and the judicial backlog related to the country's labour law framework.

https://ouci.dntb.gov.ua/en/works/4Yn26ral/?utm
The paper investigates the role of mediation and conciliation in collective labour conflict resolution in India, emphasising their usefulness in speeding up and facilitating resolution. One observes that while this will enhance industrial peace and reduce litigation, many gaps remain, including an absence of empirical evaluation of mediation results, inadequate mediator training, and insufficient institutional support. It emphasises that standardised frameworks and stronger policy measures for improving mediation effectiveness in India's industrial dispute resolution system are essential.

https://mswmanagementj.com/index.php/home/article/view/86?utm
This paper seeks to document the historical evolution of the machinery available to resolve industrial disputes in India, as well as to assess how alternative dispute resolution (ADR), which could involve negotiation, mediation or arbitration, could actually furnish more collegial and efficacious avenues for labour-management resolution. It demonstrates the disadvantages of traditional settlement methods such as protracted litigation, strikes and lock-outs and professes that ADR can offer an avenue for participative dialogue, accelerated settlement, and the sustenance of industrial relations. But at the same time, this paper recognises the gap in practice: while the applicability of ADR is hopeful in theory, it is uneven in practice, as limited institutional infrastructure, stakeholder ignorance, and strongly entrenched preferences for litigation characterise many industrial environments.

https://ijalr.in/wp-content/uploads/2024/10/EQUATING-RIGHTS-AND-EFFICIENCY-SCRUTINIZING-ALTERNATIVE-DISPUTE-RESOLUTION-IN-LABOUR-AND-WORKPLACE-CONFLICTS.pdf?utm
The paper critically reviews how alternative dispute resolution (ADR) methods like mediation, conciliation, and arbitration enhance efficiency in resolving labour and workplace conflicts while safeguarding workers' rights. It notes that ADR promotes faster, cost-effective, and cooperative settlements compared to litigation but highlights key gaps such as limited empirical research, weak institutional frameworks, and insufficient analysis of power imbalances in workplace mediation. The study emphasises the need for stronger policy support and standardised mechanisms to make ADR more effective in labour dispute resolution.

https://www.indianjournalofmanagement.com/index.php/pijom/article/view/60303?utm
The paper analyses the causes and settlement of industrial disputes in India, noting that issues like wages, bonuses, and union rivalries are key triggers of conflict. It emphasises that while arbitration and negotiation are preferred settlement methods, the overall dispute resolution system remains slow and inconsistent. The literature highlights a gap in comparative studies assessing the effectiveness of different resolution methods across industries, calling for more data-driven research to strengthen industrial harmony and policy formulation.

Structure of the Study

Chapter 1: Introduction,
Chapter 2: the conceptual background with respect to industrial dispute resolution in India.
Chapter 3:the provisions of mediation and arbitration under Indian labour law.
Chapter 4: comparative analysis between mediation and arbitration.
Chapter 5: judicial interpretations and case laws.
Chapter 6: mediation's influence in curtailing the case load of courts.
Chapter 7: key findings and policy suggestions.
Chapter 8: Conclusion.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK OF INDUSTRIAL DISPUTE RESOLUTION IN INDIA

Meaning and Nature of Industrial Disputes

Industrial Disputes refer to any form of disagreement involving employers and employees or among different categories of workmen which has a bearing on terms of employment, working conditions, or the functional aspect of industry. Section 2(k) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 defines industrial disputes as "any dispute or difference between employers and employers, or between employers and workmen, or between workmen and workmen, which is connected with the employment or non-employment, or the terms of employment, or with the conditions of labour, of any person."

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Being highly collective and socio-economic in nature, the industrial disputes can easily be differentiated from civil disputes, which are personal and contractual in nature. They may arise because of wage demand, retrenchments, layoffs, disciplinary action, or union recognition. Industrial disputes affect not only production but also workers' morale and disturb the economy. Hence, their settlement must strike a balance between industrial efficiency and social justice as envisaged under Directive Principles of State Policy (Articles 38, 39, and 43 of the Indian Constitution).

Significance of maintaining industrial peace and promoting economic growth

Industrial peace is a prerequisite for national development. Good relations between employers and employees result in increased production, investment, and economic stability, whereas strikes, lockouts, and disputes inhibit growth and erode industrial relations. The labour law system in India has aimed at institutionalizing the very mechanisms through conciliation, collective bargaining, and adjudication to promote industrial peace rather than the opposite-from the day of independence.

As per the ruling in State of Bihar v. D.N. Ganguly [AIR 1958 SC 1018], the Supreme Court held that industrial peace was a sine qua non for national progress, and the state had the obligation to ensure that disputes were settled in an orderly fashion. Accordingly, labour law in India is conceived with a view to promoting social and economic order and not merely for the enforcement of individual rights.

Traditional mechanisms of industrial dispute resolution

Before the modern method of alternative dispute resolution, conflicting industrial matters in India were mostly worked on through the statutory means laid down under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. The act was intended, broadly, to maintain industrial harmony by ensuring equity toward workers on the one hand and quite equally safeguarding the rights of the employers on the other. The functions of the act were to prevent and resolve disputes through procedures based on recognised methods of intervention by state agencies or institutional settlement, rather than on straight confrontation by labour and management. The very basis of this structure became, over time, the industrial relations edifice in India, promoting a blend of industrial efficiency and social justice.

Traditional mechanisms for industrial dispute resolution under the Industrial Disputes Act were classified as conciliation, adjudication, voluntary arbitration, and collective bargaining. Each of them had a different role: conciliation stimulated talks; adjudication provided legal finality; arbitration settled matters with consent; and collective bargaining produced awareness. While these mechanisms brought structure and stability, they came under strong criticism with regard to their slow speed, rigidity, and formalism. These very limitations led to appeals for a more participative and collaborative approach and thus paved the way for mediation and other modern ADR methodologies.

Conciliation

Conciliation constituted the first statutory step in the settlement of industrial disputes under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. It is conducted by Conciliation Officers or Conciliation Boards appointed by the state to facilitate negotiations and voluntary settlement between employers and employees. The conciliation process is based on mutual discussions aimed at compromise rather than on litigation, with the preservation of harmony within the workplace as its focal point. If a settlement is achieved, the parties are bound by it; failing that, the matter is reported to the appropriate authorities for adjudication.

However, while conciliation does gain its share in curtailing tensions and adjourning strikes, such practical effect has been limited by procedural delays, lack of proper training for conciliation officers, and political intervention. Often, conciliators lack the authority and resources to bring the two parties to a meaningful negotiating table. This, in turn, delays settlement and, in many situations, builds up discontentment among employers and employees alike. Despite these constraints, conciliation remains an obligatory factor for strengthening the attainment of cooperative industrial relations.

Adjudication

Adjudication, in keeping with the scheme of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947, is formal in character and applicable to cases in which a settlement could not be reached on conciliation. The matters fall for consideration in the discretion of Labour Courts, Industrial Tribunals, or National Tribunals, differentiated by their nature and importance. These tribunals work only in a quasi-judicial way, keeping in view the basic principles of Law; they examine evidence, hear both parties, and deliver legally mandated awards. Thus, the adjudication procedure provides for the settling of industrial disputes as per law and in conformity with the principles of natural justice, bringing stability and certainty into industrial relations.

However, the same adjudication is often criticised for being lethargic, adversarial, and technical. Being formal in nature and legalistic in content, these procedures tended to create bitterness and hostility between employer and employee, rather than promote industrial cooperation. As it were, heavy caseloads and delayed awards have reduced efficiency even further. While adjudication provides finality and enforceability, its rigidity and inflexibility make a case for collaborative, faster methods of dispute resolution.

Voluntary Arbitration

Appointed estoppel gave birth to voluntary arbitration under section 10A of the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947, allowing any of the disputing parties to mutually agree and refer a matter in dispute before an impartial arbitrator chosen by them. In arbitration, one can have a lesser formality, faster resolution, and more flexibility as the parties decide who to appoint as an arbitrator and what procedure to follow. The objective, in short, is to encourage the voluntary settlement of disputes through neutral arbitration, maintaining the relationship between management and labour. Once published, the award becomes binding and enforceable against both sides.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Despite its advantages, this mode of resolution has hardly taken root in any given instance with widespread application in India. Parties shun it for the reason they perceive state institutions to have necessary authority. The non-existence of trained arbitrators and the official delay in publishing of awards still limit it from becoming an operative arbitration setup. Nevertheless, fundamentally, party autonomy, neutrality, and efficiency formed the basis of arbitration and conciliation systems in later years.

Collective Bargaining

Collective bargaining is an informal process and indeed a core activity through which employers contract terms of employment, wages, working hours, and benefits with trade unions. It signifies industrial democracy. Workers are given a voice in making decisions that affect their welfare. Above all, collective bargaining is based on direct negotiations, trust, and compromise from both sides, in contrast to adjudication or conciliation. It helps in conflict resolution, fostering industrial peace, and cultivating cooperation at the workplace.

In India, the prospect of collective bargaining has not followed a level path. It functions more in favour of the organised sector that boasts trade union strength, while remaining underdeveloped and weak in the unorganised industry due to fragmentation of representation and lack of bargaining power among workers. Political enmity, coupled with the multiplicity of unions, often serves to undermine the negotiation process. All said and done, collective bargaining remains central to healthy industrial relations and promotes dialogue and partnership instead of litigation and confrontation.

Limitations and Transition Towards ADR

While the earlier industry mechanisms under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, were established to provide a complete and wholesome system of dispute resolution, they failed more often than not to withstand the dynamic requirements of a growing industrial economy. Long delays, bureaucratic formalities, and an adversarial system very often led to a genteel unrest and concomitant loss of productivity. Evidently, these inadequacies created space for grievances to be resolved with a more flexible approach based on cooperation and in a short time.

In the end, the inadequacy of conciliation, adjudication, and arbitration induced policymakers to shift towards modern ADR techniques such as mediation and conciliation under newer laws. These emphasise voluntary participation, confidentiality, and mutual understanding, thus shifting the focus away from legal enforcement and towards relationship preservation. Thus, this transition indicates an important development in India's industrial relations system, from essentially state-controlled adjudication to participatory, interest-based approaches to dispute resolution.

Evolution of Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) in Labour Law

Disputes had been resolved outside courts in India. In the panchayat system of yesteryear, one can find traditional community-based types of conciliation. Its first more modern interpretation in the context of industrial relations emerged with the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, which was derived from the UNCITRAL Model Law, earmarking the simplest and least complicated procedures for arbitration and conciliation in the case of commercial disputes.

Then came the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, by consolidated various labour laws and reiterated the importance of conciliation and voluntary arbitration. It also attempted to enable the conciliation officer to function rather as a mediator actively pursuing amicable settlement before formal adjudication.

The most recent enactment, the Mediation Act of 2023, creates a more robust legislative scheme for mediation. This Act sets out procedures, institutional mechanisms, and enforceability for mediated settlement agreements. For the first time, mediation receives statutory acknowledgement alongside other forms of ADR. This legislation is in step with the paradigm shift in Indian policy toward decentralised and efficient participatory dispute resolution systems that minimise reliance on the courts and tribunals.

Role of Labour Courts & Industrial Tribunals

The Labour Courts and Industrial Tribunals created under Chapter II of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, occupy a vital position in adjudicating disputes that remain unresolved through conciliation or arbitration. The Labour Courts deal with matters enumerated in the Second Schedule of the Act (e.g. discharge, reinstatement, or conditions of service), and the Industrial Tribunals deal with disputes arising under the Third Schedule (e.g. wage, working hours and bonus).

While the intervention of these courts has completely served to enforce the rights of the workers, they are bedevilled by a huge backlog of cases and administrative delays. As per recent data, thousands of industrial disputes are lying unresolved before these tribunals; it is thus quite obvious that there is an urgent need to look for alternative outlets like mediation for relieving the burden on the judicial system to retain voluntary compliance.

Challenges in the Existing Dispute Resolution Framework

A lot of challenges remain, even with a well-established statutory structure:

Delay and Backlog: Industrial tribunals and labour courts have a higher tendency of prolonged delays due to procedural formalities and a very few manpower.

Adversarial Approach: The current system often puts employers and employees as litigants rather than partners in problem-solving.

Lack of Awareness: Due to a lack of projects or allocations, the small sector or unorganised sector does not know who stakeholders would consider mediation or arbitration.

Weak Settlement Enforceability: Very often, settlements given in conciliation and voluntary arbitration are either unenforceable or are not complied with by the parties.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Limited Institutional Capacity: There are hardly any capable mediators or institutions for mediation concerning labour matters.

These issues require a structured mediation framework to be embedded within the industrial dispute framework. A regulated mediation framework could lead to settlement on time, safeguarding the industrial relations, and eventually alleviating the judicial backlog.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK OF MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION IN LABOUR LAW

Overview of Relevant Legislation

Industrial Disputes Act, 1947

The ID Act, being the chief law regarding labour dispute resolution, provides for conciliation, voluntary arbitration, and adjudication to maintain industrial peace and protect the rights and interests of workers. Under the Act, conciliation officers and boards play an important role in bringing about settlements between employers and employees. While Section 10A provides for parties to voluntarily refer disputes for arbitration, Sections 12 and 18 spell out the procedure and binding nature of settlements. While the Act was evidently one of further progress for its times, it is the procedural rigidity and bureaucratic delays in implementation that diluted its efficacy, often calling for reforms to introduce greater flexibility through ADR.

Over the decades, the ID Act served as a kind of foundation for the industrial relations regime in India, which, from time, has tried to strike a balance between state intervention and collective bargaining. Nevertheless, the changing industrial scenario and the increasing number of disputes necessitated calls for modernisation. On the other hand, the conciliation mechanism, which was established to be a benevolent one, suffered from lack of specialisation, limited resources, and an overburdened conciliation officer. Accordingly, mediation, which by now was being recognised as an important alternative, was losing its appeal. Addressing these concerns laid the framework for new laws in the form of the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, and the Mediation Act, 2023.

(b) Industrial Relations Code, 2020

The Industrial Relations Code, 2020, consolidates and streamlines provisions from earlier labour laws, the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, the Trade Unions Act, 1926, and the Industrial Employment (Standing Orders) Act, 1946. The main aim of the Code is to simplify and modernise the laws governing industrial relations. The Code continues to emphasise conciliation and arbitration as preferred methods of dispute resolution. It has given importance to the role of conciliation officers, who are now institutionalised, and the introduction of structured timelines to foster speedy settlements. Most importantly, it encourages pre-litigation resolutions through negotiation and dialogue, showcasing a change towards mediation-like processes, even within statutory conciliation.

By being current with mediatory trends in ADR, the Code seeks to provide a regime for balancing workers' rights with the flexibility required by employers. The more the Code supports participatory conflict resolution, the better it lays the groundwork for a responsive industrial relations system. The Code also provides for voluntary arbitration with greater procedural clarity for building trust and enforceability for industrial settlements. For implementation success, administrative efficiency, adequate training of mediators and conciliators, and institutional coordination between labour authorities and employers' associations would be necessary.

(c) The Arbitration and Conciliation Act was enacted in 1996.

This twenty-first legislative approach of India towards ADR is epitomised in the Arbitration and Conciliation Act of 1996, introduced in the wake of the UN-Model Law, which provides a fully-fledged framework for both domestic and international arbitration, besides conciliation. Although it is not crafted solely for industrial disputes, it has affected the notion of arbitration in industrial worlds, speed, flexibility, and self-determination being hallmarks. It enables the parties to appoint independent arbitrators, conduct proceedings in a minimally procedural sense, and hold enforceable awards that have the same status as a decree of a court.

The conciliation provisions under Part III of the 1996 Act bear remarkable similarities to mediation for industrial disputes. They encourage voluntary participation and empowerment of conciliators to instrument and effect amicable settlements. The enforceability of settlements arrived at by conciliation provides legal certainty. This framework serves as a model for the new Mediation Act, 2023, which consolidates further mediation as a structured and legally recognised mechanism in India. Together, these Acts shall now form the backbone of the evolving ADR ecosystem in India, which facilitates negotiated settlements over litigation.

(d) Mediation Act, 2023

Mediation is institutionalised as a formal mechanism for dispute resolution in India with an epoch-making landmark law, the Mediation Act, 2023. It lays down a legal backing for mediation, both pre-litigation and post-litigation, in all commercial and civil matters and certain labour matters. The process, qualifications of mediators, confidentiality and enforcement of structured settlements as defined in the Act cover the Mediation Council of India in formation, for the regulation of mediators and further upliftment of training and accreditation standards. Tied to a growing recognition of mediation as an integral part of access to justice, this institutionalisation is reflective.

In the context of labour law, there is now a Mediation Act that can completely change the handling of industrial disputes. The process is legal, time-bound, and confidential; thus, it is complementary to the existing conciliation methods under the Industrial Disputes Act and Industrial Relations Code. Encourages discussion between conflicting parties before resorting to arbitration or adjudication. It touches on neutrality, voluntariness, and enforceability, which go well with the goals of peace in industry and cooperative negotiation that make the Act stand high in bringing India to modernisation in the internal industrial disputes resolution system.

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Statutory Provisions Governing Mediation and Conciliation

Labour law mediation and conciliation procedures are embedded in social legislation that is intent on amicable settlement. These statutes include the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947; it defines in Sections 4 to 12 the duties of conciliation officers and boards in securing voluntary settlements. These provisions are meant to encourage the parties to reach their settlements through negotiation before it comes to the adjudicative escalation of disputes. Thus, the 2020 Industrial Relations Code strengthens these provisions by providing for obligatory conciliation for certain types of disputes and deadlines to ensure expeditious resolution. Both frameworks assume that informal dialogue often leads to more sustainable industrial harmony than adversarial proceedings.

The Mediation Act, 2023 goes to the extent of entrenching these cardinal principles in the formal codifying mediator as a distinct legal process. It makes mediation obligatory before entering litigation for certain disputes and enables the legally enforceability of mediated settlements as binding obligations. This marks the first stride in bridging the divide between statutory conciliation and voluntary mediation. Together, these provisions indicate an intention by India to promote a cooperative, organised, and rights-based approach to resolving labour disputes. Thus, combined legislative frameworks will ensure that mediation and conciliation do not provide substitutes for justice but rather facilitators of industrial peace.

Comparative Analysis of Arbitration and Mediation Procedure

Arbitration and mediation are generally two modes of ADR; nevertheless, their general purposes and courses differ. A binding award is given by an independent arbitrator after assessing the evidence and arguments, which implies that the arbitration process is, in essence, quasi-judicial. In contrast, mediation does not adjudicate proceedings but acts upon voluntary resolution by the parties. Thus, arbitration relates to legal enforceability and finality, while mediation relates to mutual understanding, communication, and protection of relationships. This makes arbitration very suitable in industrial disputes since it involves continuing employment relationships.

Thus, procedural arbitration in the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, is actually formalised into things such as the submission of claims, hearings, and written awards. Mediation, under the Act of 2023, allows flexibility in scheduling, confidentiality, and drafting settlements. While arbitration adds a degree of certainty by making awards enforceable, mediation offers flexibility and speed through consensus-building. Using mediation as a first step to promote settlement and, last, arbitration would create balance by creating efficiency while maintaining fairness and stability in the industry.

Institutional Mechanisms: Labour Commissioners, Mediation Centres, and Arbitral Tribunals

Institutional mechanisms will play a crucial role in the implementation of ADR in the area of labour relations. Labour Commissioners and conciliation officers, as per the Industrial Disputes Act and Industrial Relations Code, are generally neutral facilitators promoting amicable solutions for disputes. These bodies act as the first level of intervention to prevent a disruption in industrial peace. The establishment of mediation centres by the state labour departments and industrial boards has further strengthened the early intervention of the conflict resolution mechanisms. These centres facilitate pre-dispute counselling sessions and suggestions for direct negotiations between management and unions.

Arbitral tribunals and labour courts are also more formalised and thus structured in their adjudicatory support where mediation fails. Their awards are enforced by way of decretal orders. The growing interaction between mediation centres and arbitral institutions establishes a shift toward an integrated ADR model. Those institutions, therefore, yield a comprehensive institutional ecosystem that integrates voluntary negotiation and legal enforcement to prologue both flexibility and accountability in the resolution of industrial disputes.

Enforceability and Recognition of Settlement Award

The enforceability of settlements is the magic that gives credibility to mediation and arbitration. In the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947, conciliation proceedings mark the settlement as binding upon all parties to a dispute under Section 18. Thus, the award of arbitration is treated on the same footing as a decree of a civil court as laid down in the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. The Mediation Act, 2023 prefers the role of mediator settlements by bestowing upon them the stature of enforceable contracts in order to ensure certainty and compliance.

Such recognition of these awards will strengthen the confidence of people in ADR mechanisms and will reduce their reliance on protracted court litigation. It will assure the parties that those agreements entered into in good faith will have similar binding force as a judicial determination. The law is geared toward achieving harmonization between mediation, conciliation, and arbitration statute, thereby rendering a formidable contribution in cementing alternative dispute resolutions in industrial relations. Thus, the enforceability of settlements gives credence to ADR processes so that they would no longer be advisory but would carry tangible legal weight; thus contributing towards industrial peace and stability.

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS – MEDIATION VS. ARBITRATION IN LABOUR AND INDUSTRIAL DISPUTES

Conceptual Distinctions Between Mediation and Arbitration

Mediation and arbitration are both categorized as Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) methods; however, they belong to different worlds in terms of their nature, purpose, and outcomes. Mediation, on the one hand, is a facilitative and voluntary process wherein a neutral third party assists the disputing parties in communicating, pinpointing issues, and exploring options for settlement. It is the mediator's role not to render a decision but rather assist the parties in coming to a mutually acceptable arrangement. In this way, mediation remains non-binding until the parties agree on the terms and witness the settlement. Mediation deals with interests, rather

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

than legal rights, in preserving relationships and fostering cooperation. This aspect makes it quite successful in disputes involving ongoing employment or collective bargaining, in which it is obvious that both parties will have future dealings with each other.

The reverse phenomenon is quite different in arbitration. In arbitration, an arbitrator or a panel of arbitrators conducts hearings and issues a decision called an arbitral award, which is binding. The process is modeled on an adjudicative process wherein the rules of evidence, fairness, and due process apply. Finality, legal certainty, and enforceability are the watchwords of arbitration, which has often replaced long-drawn-out court litigation. While mediation is geared towards building consensus, arbitration is about handing down a decision. Therefore, the choice will depend on whether binding resolution or negotiated understanding is required. Whereas a blend of both processes might be appropriate to achieve legally enforceable results while simultaneously maintaining workplace harmony.

Advantages of Mediation in Industrial Context

In the industrial relations context, mediation stands to have a great number of advantages mainly due to flexibility and speed with great emphasis on collaboration. With mediation, unlike arbitration or adjudication, the parties retain control over both the process and the outcome. The very informality of mediation gives the parties the license to communicate freely so that workers and employers can express their grievances and concerns without the constraints of procedure. This sort of open dialogue usually brings about creative solutions that deal with the origins of disputes rather than just the legal view. Furthermore, by consensus and cooperation, mediation tends to protect long-term relationships between management and employees, which is one very important factor in workplaces in which ongoing cooperation is paramount.

Another huge advantage for mediation is the ability to avert or reverse escalation or industrial unrest. By intervening at an earlier stage, mediators can dissolve tensions before they mature into strikes, lockouts, or litigation. The process further affords confidentiality to the parties, which aids in protecting their reputations, thus minimizing the adverse publicity surrounding industrial disputes. Mediation confers a comparative cost benefit to the parties in terms of time, and hence is least damaging, in either party's consideration, in terms of economic losses. The voluntary nature of the settlement process grants a further motive for compliance, since the final terms are self-determined by the very parties involved, as opposed to externally imposed. Thus, mediation comes closest to the goals of industrial peace, worker welfare, and production efficacy.

Limitations of Mediation as Compared to Arbitration

Its greatest disadvantage is that mediation is nonbinding. Unless the parties voluntarily agree and put their settlement in writing, a mediator has no power to enforce anything. Interfering with mediation in such situations becomes a problem if one party has acted in bad faith or one party refuses to honour the agreement later on. Thus, in mediation, huge amounts of reliance are placed on the mediator being capable, neutral, and credible. Bad or unprofessional mediation would not facilitate a resolution that would be acceptable to either side, but rather generate further distrust. The absence of enforceable laws until the enactment of the Mediation Act, 2023, often resulted in differences in practice and uncertainty about the legal validity of settlements.

On the other hand, the result of arbitration is a legally enforceable resolution that puts an end to the dispute. It is better suited for more complicated questions of fact or law, which carry the need for authoritative determination. Mediation may sometimes be unsuitable in situations where parties have marked structural differences in bargaining power, or should their rights are statutory. Also, whereas mediation places a premium on confidentiality, this is desirable for the sides, but it may also hide important public policy issues with respect to labour rights violations or safety issues. Thus, mediation should be preferred to maintain relationships; however, if arbitration is really needed for determining legal validity with enforceable remedies in any case, mediation may not totally replace arbitration.

Comparative Benefits: Speed, Cost, Confidentiality, Relationship Preservation

While comparing mediation with arbitration, it stands out that mediation is faster and cheaper. Mediation can be called and take place in a few days or weeks, while arbitration takes months, with procedural hearings, disclosure of evidence, and legal representation. In mediation, the lesser amount of money is paid, as there are no filing fees, no lengthy documentation, and few witnesses. This is why mediation is best for any small and medium enterprise or trade union short of funds. It is the timely solutions that mediation provides that discount industrial stagnation and economic.

Mediation once again is superior with respect to confidentiality and relationship preservation. Talks and settlements are kept private, averting damage to corporate reputations and protecting workers from being publicly exposed for grievances. The spirit of cooperation nurtured by mediation enhances communication and empathy-and thus maintains long-term industrial peace. For considering arbitration, arbitration is confidential but acrimonious clear winner and a loser-which has poisoned industrial relations. But arbitration has enforceability and finality. This is a balanced approach where mediation can be taken as an avenue of first negotiation, albeit for issues that remain unresolved by mediation, to go to arbitration. Thus, by combining the two approaches, one could enjoy the best of both avenues.

Case-Based Comparisons and Empirical Insights

Judicial precedents in India and abroad reveal enormously instructive comparative aspects of mediation and arbitration alike. In various cases heard under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, Indian courts have laid emphasis on conciliation and negotiation before litigation, stressing the importance of a settlement--one that sustains industrial peace. The tribunals have been frequently endorsing mediated settlements to be binding under Section 18 of the Act, which also testified to the

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

judiciary's preference in favour of the non-adversarial mechanisms. Likewise, the approval of arbitration awards under Section 10A as binding and enforceable indicates that mediation and arbitration do deserve space for consideration under the overarching purview of labour dispute resolution.

The findings of empirical studies and surveys of industry practice confirm that mediation, in satisfying disputants, has the ability to afford some control over the process of obtaining their own resolution. While arbitration has a different legally achievable effect, in practice, it often resolves a case to the dissatisfaction of one party, compromising future relations with regard to cooperation in renewed negotiations. Whether in the United Kingdom, Australia, or Singapore, comparative data show parallel trends of mediation working faster with lesser costs and repeat conflict: The mediation process, needless to state, is not critical for statutory interpretation, choosing between various mutually exclusive, highly complex employment contracts, or collective bargaining impasse sorts of cases. This clearly indicates that the hybrid system that would put mediation in the prior position to arbitration takes an even view in functioning practically toward the realisation of industrial justice.

Role of Mediators and Arbitrators in Ensuring Industrial Harmony

The successful performance of mediation and arbitration is highly dependent upon the professional competence and impartiality of the professional conducting said procedures. Mediators facilitate communication and assist the parties in discovering mutual interests. Their primary objective is to restore trust and foster cooperation instead of assessing blame. Good mediators must also possess good negotiating, emotional, and industrial relations skills. They are practice facilitators in dialogue, making both management and labour feel heard and respected. Thus, they assist not only in a resolution to the immediate problem but in fostering a culture of mutual respect and communication that will help resolve future conflicts.

On the other hand, arbitrators more actively exercise a judicial role. They guarantee fairness and procedural integrity and preserve respect for the principles of natural justice. Their decisions constitute the legal closure and enforceability that decides the maintenance of discipline and certainty across the industrial panorama. Highly talented arbitrators strike a balance between technical knowledge of law and practical understanding of industrial operations, rendering awards both just and realistic. In the combined roles of mediation and arbitration, these two remain the supporting pillars of industrial harmony; the former brings about consensus, and the latter enforces it. The extent to which these two remain complementary in their function warrants an understanding of building institutional capacity, undertaking professional training, and fostering ethical standards for the effective resolution of labour disputes.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION AND CASE LAW ANALYSIS

Landmark Indian Case Laws on Mediation and Arbitration in Industrial Disputes:

Introduced in India, the Act specifying arbitration and conciliation settled for industrial disputes, for its judicial conception, long recognized the imperative of an amicable settlement for the industrial disputes. The pronouncements made by the Supreme Court in landmark judgments were mainly emphasizing conciliation and negotiations before the resort to adjudication in settlement of industrial disputes. The Workmen of Dimakuchi Tea Estate v. Management of Dimakuchi Tea Estate (1958) amounted to a grand pronouncement shedding light on the spirit of social justice as well as the economic objective of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, while laying stress on industrial peace with workers' rights being diminished. Likewise, in Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage Board v. A. Rajappa (1978), the Court put again that what needs to be fostered is the shift in industrial law toward cooperation instead of confrontation, which has about begun the line of consensual method of dispute resolution such as mediation and conciliation.

Then, another landmark decision was given in the State of Bihar v. D.N. Ganguly (1959), reinforcing the importance of early settlement through negotiation or conciliation, where the Court defined the ambit of government referral in industrial disputes. In Sirsilk Ltd. v. Government of Andhra Pradesh (1963), the Supreme Court upheld the validity of settlements reached informally under Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act. These judgments, taken together, reflect the consistent approach of the judiciary in favour of dialogue-based dispute resolution over the years to contend that voluntary agreement builds industrial relations more effectively than litigation.

Judicial Approach Towards ADR under the Industrial Disputes Act

Under the Industrial Disputes Act of 1947, the Indian judiciary has shaped up a more realistic and reform-oriented approach, encouraging the use of ADR mechanisms. The courts have been pointing out time and again that the essence of the Act rests upon conciliation, compromise, and industrial harmony. For example, in Herbertsons Ltd. v. Workmen (1976) the Supreme Court laid down that voluntary settlements under collective bargaining and conciliation should take priority over adjudication, since they express the free will of the parties concerned. The Court also pointed out that the Act's aim is not punishment, but resolution; thus accentuating the preventive and remedial nature of conciliation and mediation.

In Workmen of Delhi Cloth & General Mills Ltd. v. Management (1970), the Supreme Court also observed that conciliation represents the foundation of industrial peace; thus, tribunals ought to encourage parties to see whether they can reach an amicable settlement before proceeding to formal adjudication. This judicial attitude coincides with the preamble of the Act, which foresees establishing "industrial peace and prosperity through cooperation." Through such interpretations, the courts have not only safeguarded the continued relevance of conciliation and mediation within the statutory framework but

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

have also steered the attention of policymakers towards strengthening ADR as a sustainable mechanism for industrial governance.

Supreme Court and High Court Judgments on ADR in the Labour Context

Supreme and High Courts have played an important role in developing the ADR regime for the labour and employment sector. In the case of Salem Advocate Bar Association v. Union of India (2003), the Supreme Court upheld the constitutional validity of Section 89 of the Code of Civil Procedure, which imposes an obligation on the Court to encourage the settlement of civil disputes through modes of ADR, such as mediation, going ahead and conciliation, and arbitration. While the matter was civil in nature, the principles were applied to industrial matters, making Labour Courts and Tribunals also adhere to this method to some extent. In a similar vein, in Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (2010), the Court elaborated upon the procedural framework of mediation, stating that mediation not only helps in clearing the backlog of judiciary matters but also promotes participatory justice.

In their view, the courts have recognised that any dispute relating to labour goes on to restore the industrial balance through ADR. Well-defined Arbitrability was provided by the Supreme Court in National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Boghara Polyfab Pvt. Ltd. (2009), along with matters that can be subjected to arbitration. Notwithstanding the few employment disputes that are considered non-arbitrable for reasons of public policy, the Court has given arbitration the thumbs up in relation to any disputes arising from the service of contractual obligations in the industrial field. The High Courts of Delhi, Bombay, and Madras upheld Section 18(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act for any settlements that are so agreed upon, stating that the settlement has a binding force. These judgments show the progressive approach the judiciary has taken towards the establishment of ADR in India's industrial jurisprudence.

Analysis of Case Laws under the Mediation Act, 2023 and the Arbitration Act, 1996

With the enactment of the Mediation Act, 2023, mediation in India has gained statutory recognition, and the courts have begun interpreting its provisions to implement and give effect to it. Some of the salient features of the Act include pre-litigation mediation, confidentiality, neutrality, and enforceability as civil decrees of settlement agreements. The judicial interpretation is still at the infancy stage; however, the decisions so far have ushered in a few pronouncements treating the Mediation Act as complementary to the existing labour legislation. The courts have pronounced that industrial disputes, hitherto resolved via conciliation, now have a much wider legal basis for mediation, lending itself to more structured and enforceable outcomes while maintaining flexibility.

With respect to the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996, the judiciary has actively worked to reinforce arbitration's credibility and independence. Landmark judgments like ONGC v. Saw Pipes Ltd. (2003) and Bharat Aluminium Co. v. Kaiser Aluminium Technical Services Inc. (2012) redefined the contours of arbitral jurisdiction and enforcement. While these decisions arose in the commercial context, the reasoning has affected arbitration concerning labour by stressing that it warrants minimal judicial interference and finality of awards. Further, the post-amendment interpretations after the 2015 and 2019 Arbitration Amendments have strongly fortified the position for institutional arbitration and time-bound proceedings, thus becoming a model to be followed for labour-specific arbitrations. The Mediation Act and Arbitration Act, in conjunction, stand for a harmonized statutory framework balancing voluntary resolution and enforceable justice.

Lessons from International Jurisprudence (UK, US, ILO Models)

Countries across the globe, with the UK, the US, and ILO, have established well-entrenched models of mediation and arbitration in industrial relations. In the United Kingdom, the Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) provides structured conciliation and arbitration services widely utilized by employers and trade unions. ACAS acts with a statutory mandate to promote collective bargaining and early dispute resolution, whereby binding settlements are often made once formalized. This model demonstrates the ways in which institutionalized mediation mechanisms facilitate prevention of litigation and sustain industrial cooperation. The experience in the UK demonstrated that the mediators' credibility and neutrality would be vital for long-term industrial peace.

In the US, the same task is performed by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS), with emphasis on voluntary mediation and arbitration in collective bargaining disputes. In their conventions and recommendations, the ILO promotes mediation and conciliation as key tools for social dialogue and industrial democracy. International comparisons provide good lessons to the Indian system with respect to the evolving ADR processes. They echo the importance of mediation institutions backed by the state and making pre-litigation processes mandatory while training professional mediators. The infusion of such internationally successful practices into the Indian setup under the Mediation Act, 2023, and the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, can enhance the efficiency, credibility, and accessibility of labour dispute resolution mechanisms.

MEDIATION AND JUDICIAL BACKLOG – A POLICY PERSPECTIVE

Perusal of Industrial Disputes and Unload of Labour Courts and Tribunals Up to the Year 2023

It has an old history of the industrial dispute resolution system in the country that has always been burdened by the weight of delays, procedural complexities, and mammoth unpacked caseloads. The Labour Courts and Industrial Tribunals were created as part of a national tribunal under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, to adjudicate any conflicts of interest between an employer and an employee. In fact, the increasing number of industrial disputes within the country, with the meagre judicial resources, has already developed a backlog. Thousands of pending cases in courts and tribunals have been unresolved for years, mostly surrounding reinstations, wage scale revisions, or unfair labour practices. This leads to long periods of uncertainty for both management and workers, in

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

addition to violating even the idea of industrial justice--quick and equitable settlement.

Again, consideration of procedural rigidity and effective conciliation mechanisms has made the formal adjudicatory process very cumbersome. Instead of a few months for resolving labour disputes, it takes years for some of them to gain finality because of appeals and administrative inefficiencies. The cumulative effect has been erosion of trust in the adjudicatory system and declining productivity in the industry. Pendency of disputes would interfere with business continuity; lower morale among employees, and by extension, economic growth. That is why there is an increasing realisation that the litigation-oriented models are rather unsuitable for the dynamic nature of contemporary industrial relations, which makes a compelling case for adopting mediation as a sustainable alternative.

Mediation as a Tool of Judicial Efficiency

The use of mediation, which diverts a lot of disputes from the formal court system through encouraging dialogue and consensus to resolve conflict, has become a tool for transforming the rigid judicial backlog into speedy justice, and industrial disputes will all be solved by this form of mediation. In other words, mediation does not take on the form of adjudication, which is combatant and time-heavy; it is cooperative, confidential, and flexible. There are minimum procedural formalities, which allow the parties to address the underlying issues promptly and constructively. The Mediation Act of 2023 institutionalizes this approach in terms of mandating pre-litigation mediation in particular cases, thus lessening the flow of disputes to Labour Courts and Industrial Tribunals.

From a policy perspective, mediation leads towards judicial efficiency and access to justice. It frees adjudicatory resources for the really complex or legally sensitive cases that need adjudicating. According to studies carried out by the Law Commission of India and the Ministry of Labour, a well-conceived mediation process can resolve a dispute in weeks rather than years. As such, litigation costs are greatly reduced for both employers and employees. People also tend to comply with mediated settlements more than when directed to do so under the high courts. Mediation, therefore, reduces backlogs but improves the legitimacy of the justice system for, ensuring timely outcomes and participation.

Implementational Institutional Challenges and Discrepancies

Even with a lot of potential, the effort to implement mediation into the labour sphere in India faces severe obstacles from the state and institutional points of view. The most urgent problem now is that there are no trained mediators with sufficient knowledge in industrial relations, employment law, and negotiation techniques. Still, most mediation processes are carried out by officials dealing with conciliations, not neutral facilitators. The absence of a specialized mediation cadre, along with insufficiently consistent outcomes, tends to undermine confidence in these processes, not only externally by all stakeholders but also among the parties themselves. Finally, the procedural ambiguity generated by the overlap between conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Act and mediation under the Mediation Act, 2023, needs to be harmonised through policy reform or judicial clarification.

Another aspect is the unawareness and nonacceptance of mediation among employers, trade unions, and workers. The majority of the parties still view litigation as a more authoritative and trustworthy route to go because of the enforceable effect of court judgments. The most important institutions that should be in place as mediation centres, portals for digital mediation, and funds for training mediators are not properly established. The aspect of monitoring and data collection on mediation outcomes in industrial matters is also presently at an inadequate level for evidence-based evaluation of its effectiveness. Institutional capacity building, creating specialised industrial mediation centres, and introducing mediation training within labour administration programs will facilitate the development of mediation as a mainstream branch of industrial justice rather than merely an alternative.

Role of the Government, Employers, and Trade Unions in Strengthening Mediation

The realization of mediation in resolving industrial disputes depends on coordinated action from the government, employers, and the trade unions. The government has a very important role to perform here, both as a regulator and as a facilitator. It must ensure that a conducive legal framework is established under the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, and the Mediation Act, 2023, and that implementation proceeds with guidelines regarding procedure, funding, and the necessary institutional infrastructure. The Labour Ministry can work in conjunction with the state governments to set up regional mediation centres while creating a national registry of accredited mediators in labour and employment law. Governance should further be about awareness and training that will make mediation a well-accepted method of resolving disputes on the basis of rights freely and effectively.

Employers and trade unions are put into this scenario as the second responsible party in strengthening mediation. Employers should put mediation clauses into collective bargaining agreements and internal grievance redressal mechanisms to ensure that disputes are constructively handled before any litigation. Trade unions should not treat mediation as the compromise of workers' rights in the first instance, but see it as an opportunity for fair outcomes secured through participation and negotiation. This would also build some trust deficits between the stakeholders through joint training programs and policy dialogues. Thus are the three—the government, management, and labour—all actively promoting mediation, it may cease to be seen as an experimental process and transform into a bedrock of the industrial relations system in India.

Comparative Study of Judicial Efficiency: India versus Global Practices

International comparisons illustrate mediation's successes in relieving judicial burdens in industrial disputes across the globe. In the UK, early conciliation endorsed by the Advisory,

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

Conciliation and Arbitration Service (ACAS) has seen settlements of over 70% of disputes without tribunal hearings, leading to a substantial easing of backlog and lending respectability to the employment justice system. Similarly, in the US, the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service (FMCS) operates nationally to mediate disputes in collective bargaining so as to effect immediate settlements and avoid costly strikes or lockouts. Both examples show the wonder of judicial efficiency accomplished through structured mediation arrangement facilitated by the government with the help of professional mediators.

On the other hand, the backlog of India is considered one of the largest in the world, even with a very strong labour law regime. The success of the models paraphrased above depends on the autonomy of the institutions, continuous training of mediators, and the integration of such institutions with wider industrial policy. The ILO gives great importance to voluntary conciliation and mediation via social dialogue and industrial democracy. The adoption of such global best practices, especially limited to data-based policy-making, technology-based mediation platforms, and statutory incentives for early settlement, can help bring to India the same success. By buttressing mediation in a policy framework, we can move the industrial dispute context in the nation from confrontation to collaboration, thus achieving judicial efficiency and industrial peace.

FINDINGS, SUGGESTIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Key Findings

The research demonstrates that mediation, as an avenue for resolution of industrial and labour disputes, has great opportunities in India and is better placed compared to arbitration and adjudication. Flexibility, confidentiality, cost-saving nature, and long-term perspective in the coexistence of industrial relationships are the most potent factors in mediation. Whereas, arbitration leads to a binding and always hostile mechanism for a decision, mediation fosters dialogue and cooperation between the employer(s) and employee(s). The work has also shown that mediation fulfills the constitutional aims of social justice and industrial peace under Articles 38 and 43 of the Constitution of India. The establishment of the Mediation Act, 2023, has provided further vigour to the process by bridging the grey areas between statutory conciliation under the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and voluntary resolution processes.

It further analyses whether mediation and arbitration are part of industrial justice and fit together or are mutually exclusive. Arbitration will remain an important factor granting finality and enforceability of settlements; it has even more significance in complex legal disputes. However, the study emphasizes certain drawbacks: limited training of mediators, confusion in procedures, and insufficient institutional infrastructure to use mediation effectively. Through case law analysis, it has manifested the willingness of the courts to promote ADR, but the inconsistent application from tribunal to tribunal proves to be the bump in its speedway. The findings, taken together, emphasise that an integrated, hybrid dispute resolution model consisting of mediation and arbitration would best capture and satisfy the twin criteria of efficiency and fairness in industrial relations.

Policy and Legal Reform Suggestions

From a policy perspective, the study recommends that mediation should be formally recognised as the first mandatory step to resolve industrial disputes before adjudication or arbitration. Such provisions can be possibly achieved through coordinating reforms in the Industrial Relations Code, 2020 and the Mediation Act, 2023. Mandatory pre-litigation mediation would not only ease the judicial backlog but would also foster settlements based on interests at the earliest. The government must draw up procedural guidelines clarifying the interplay between mediation, conciliation, and arbitration so as to remove the ambiguity presently existing between these overlapping mechanisms. In order to ensure promptness and accountability, time frames for mediation proceedings should be fixed in statute, akin to the time frame for arbitration as per the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996.

The legal reform must also secure the enforcement of mediated settlements. The Mediation Act, 2023, by implication, assures that mediated agreements shall be treated as court decrees; this should definitely extend to industrial disputes under the Industrial Disputes Act and the Industrial Relations Code. In cases of non-compliance, there should also be facilitative mechanisms for enforcing mediated settlements through the court. Furthermore, the Labour Commissioners and Industrial Tribunals should be empowered to record and enforce mediated settlements to attain legal effect. This measure would tether mediation closely to the law and further strengthen its credibility as an efficient and trusted mechanism for resolving industrial disputes.

Proposal for a Hybrid Dispute Resolution Model Sequence (Mediation-Arbitration)

The study proposes a hybrid-form dispute resolution model under which mediation and arbitration operate in sequence. Under this model, all industrial disputes, be they individual or collective, should first be subjected to a structured mediation process. Should mediation succeed, the parties would sign a settlement agreement, which would thus be enforceable in law by virtue of the Mediation Act, 2023. However, if mediation fails to resolve the dispute within a stipulated period, it should automatically go to arbitration under the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996. In this way, mediation fosters cooperative spirit while arbitration guarantees finality and enforceability—an ideal mix of flexibility with legal certainty.

The hybrid model is usually known by the name Med-Arb in other parts of the world; it functions nicely, for instance, in Singapore and China. It gives the parties a chance to settle amicably before going for binding adjudication, so relationships are preserved while closure is assured. The introduction of this model in India in the context of labour would require institutional convergence of mediation centres, arbitration panels, and Labour Departments. The approach can either be introduced through an amendment in the Industrial Relations Code, 2020 or by enacting separate Industrial Mediation and Arbitration Rules. This kind of system would

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

ensure that disputes move smoothly from negotiation to resolution, minimising delay, curbing litigation costs, and increasing confidence in India's industrial justice architecture.

Strengthening Institutional and Training Frameworks

For mediation to reach any of its intended objectives, robust institutions and human resources must be built up. There is no dedicated system of accredited industrial mediators in India, resulting in uneven quality and outcomes. The setting up of National and State Industrial Mediation Centres will fill this void by keeping panels of professional mediators who are trained in labour law, negotiations, and conflict management. The government should develop a common standardized training curriculum with the judicial academies, universities, and International Labour Organization (ILO) for training and certifying such mediators. The framework must incorporate continuous professional development, code of ethics, and performance evaluation to uphold neutrality and competency.

Another area for institutional strengthening is to see the digitalization of mediation processes. Online Mediation Platforms (OMPs) could be integrated within the Labour Ministry's Samadhan Portal or any such system to provide possible expedited registration of cases, sharing of documents, and virtual mediation sessions. Employers' associations and trade unions should be encouraged to establish in-house mediation cells to address workplace grievances, on an enterprise level, prior to their escalation to formal dispute levels. By strengthening capacity, ensuring transparency, and accepting technology, India can create a sustainable ecosystem whereby mediation function alongside existing industrial adjudicative institutions.

Future Scenarios for Mediation in Industrial Relations

The employment of mediation in India's industrial relations has a fair chance of brightening up, especially with changes in the legal landscape and growing policy support. As industries develop newer forms and workplaces grow increasingly complex, the demand for quick, amicable, and participatory resolution of disputes will keep climbing. The government focus on ease of doing business and industrial harmony gives a conducive environment for mediation to be institutionalized. With the backing provided by the Mediation Act, 2023, offering an exhaustive legal setting, India can now claim a regional leadership position in ADR-oriented industrial governance. The emerging use of digital mediation platforms with hybrid (Med-Arb) processes adds to the convenience and efficacy.

There is, however, a necessary condition to be met for the success of such unraveled potentials: all river stakeholders must be committed for an extended period in the future. Government actions for viability, consensual spirit from the employers and trade unions, and continual professionalization of mediators will be the basis of development. Also, academic institutions and think-tanks should do empirical research to measure mediations and develop data-driven insights for influencing policy improvements. Over time, mediation should transition from being "alternative" to being perceived as primary in resolving industrial disputes, thus supporting a shift from confrontation to collaboration in India's industrial relations terrain. This watershed change would not only lessen the backlog of courts but also create a culture of dialogue, dignity, and trust in the world of work.

CONCLUSION

Mediation has become one of the best and the most advanced methods for resolving labour and industrial disputes in India. Unlike litigation or arbitration, mediation emphasises dialogue and trust and voluntary involvement and thus preserves and maintains the relationships within the workplace while disputes are amicably settled. With the Mediation Act, 2023, India has institutionalised a modern collaborative model that follows the constitutional vision of justice, social welfare and industrial harmony. Mediation is crucial in reducing backlog and timely resolution since it is efficient, flexible and confidential.

At the same time, effective resolution of disputes needs a delicate balance between co-operation and legal certainty. Mediation ought to be supplemented by enforceable mechanisms such as arbitration to make settlement both fair and binding. Such balance is provided in the Mediation Act, 2023, the Arbitration and Conciliation Act, 1996 and the Industrial Relations Code, 2020 in the complementarity of flexibility with legal protection. The three acts create a hybrid framework of consensual settlement and statutory enforceability resulting in efficiency and justice.

The future of industrial peace in india lies with institutionalizing mediation as a compulsory first step in resolving every labour dispute. The contribution of efforts in achieving this objective is the enhancement of mediation centres, the training of mediators, and the sensitisation of trade unions and employers. In borrowing from best practices from all over the world, India should continue to build a culture of negotiation and cooperation, as opposed to confrontation. A combined model of mediation and arbitration would give a peaceful and legal structure to follow. Industrial justice in the long run will not depend on triumph over adversity; rather, it will depend on the development of trust, equity, and respect on the part of labour and management — the actual bedrock of industrial peace and national progress.

BIBLIOGRAPHY / REFERENCES

Statutes and Legislation

1. *The Industrial Disputes Act*, No. 14 of 1947, § 4–7, India Code (1947).
2. *The Industrial Relations Code*, No. 35 of 2020, § 53–67, India Code (2020).
3. *The Arbitration and Conciliation Act*, No. 26 of 1996, India Code (1996).
4. *The Mediation Act*, No. 29 of 2023, India Code (2023).
5. *The Legal Services Authorities Act*, No. 39 of 1987, India Code (1987).
6. *The Constitution of India*, arts. 38, 43, 226 & 227.

Case Law (India)

1. *Salem Advocate Bar Ass'n v. Union of India*, (2005) 6 S.C.C. 344 (India).
2. *Afcons Infrastructure Ltd. v. Cherian Varkey Construction Co. (P) Ltd.*, (2010) 8 S.C.C. 24 (India).
3. *Sukanya Holdings Pvt. Ltd. v. Jayesh H. Pandya*, (2003) 5 S.C.C. 531 (India).

ISSN (Online): 2455-3662
EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR) - Peer Reviewed Journal
Volume: 11| Issue: 11| November 2025|| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2013 || SJIF Impact Factor 2025: 8.691 || ISI Value: 1.188

4. *Fertilizer Corp. of India Ltd. v. Workmen*, A.I.R. 1981 S.C. 344 (India).
5. *National Insurance Co. Ltd. v. Boghara Polyfab (P) Ltd.*, (2009) 1 S.C.C. 267 (India).
6. *Karnal Leather Karamchari Sangathan v. Liberty Footwear Co.*, (1990) 3 S.C.C. 441 (India).
7. *Bangalore Water Supply & Sewerage Board v. A. Rajappa*, A.I.R. 1978 S.C. 548 (India).
8. *Mysore Sugar Co. Ltd. v. State of Mysore*, A.I.R. 1953 S.C. 91 (India).
9. *ONGC Ltd. v. Saw Pipes Ltd.*, (2003) 5 S.C.C. 705 (India).
10. *Board of Trustees of the Port of Mumbai v. Dilipkumar Raghavendranath Nadkarni*, (1983) 1 S.C.C. 124 (India).

Case Law (International)

1. *British Leyland (U.K.) Ltd. v. Swift, [1981] I.R.L.R. 91 (U.K. Emp. App. Trib.).*
2. *Transport Workers Union of Australia v. Brisbane Airport Corp. Ltd., (2002) 114 F.C.R. 285 (Austl.).*
3. *AT&T Mobility LLC v. Concepcion, 563 U.S. 333 (2011) (U.S.).*
4. *Rogers v. Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith Inc., 385 F. Supp. 3d 302 (S.D.N.Y. 2019) (U.S.).*

Books and Commentaries

1. *O.P. Malhotra & Indu Malhotra, The Law and Practice of Arbitration and Conciliation (LexisNexis 2022).*
2. *S.C. Srivastava, Industrial Relations and Labour Laws (Vikas Publishing House 2021).*
3. *K.D. Srivastava, Law Relating to Industrial Disputes in India (Eastern Book Co. 2018).*
4. *P.C. Tripathi, Modern Labour Laws and Industrial Relations (Central Law Publications 2019).*
5. *G.B. Reddy, Law of Industrial Disputes (Gogia Law Agency 2020).*
6. *Sumeet Malik, Mediation: Practice and Procedure in India (Eastern Book Co. 2023).*
7. *Fali S. Nariman, The Spirit of Arbitration (Oxford University Press 2021).*
8. *T.R. Subramanya, Alternative Dispute Resolution in India: Law and Practice (SAGE Publications 2020).*

Journal Articles and Research Papers

1. *R. Rajagopal, "Revisiting Conciliation and Mediation in Industrial Disputes," 60 Journal of the Indian Law Institute 122 (2018).*
2. *Anuradha Saha, "Mediation in Industrial Relations: An Emerging Trend," 12 NALSAR Law Review 85 (2021).*
3. *M.K. Chauhan, "Industrial Relations and ADR: Comparative Lessons from India and the UK," 8 Indian Journal of Labour Economics 97 (2020).*
4. *N. Dutta, "Evaluating the Mediation Act, 2023: A Step Towards Institutionalized ADR," 15 National Law Review 43 (2024).*
5. *R. Bhattacharya, "ADR and Labour Justice: A Policy Perspective," 14 International Journal of Law and Management 66 (2022).*
6. *P. Kaur, "Arbitration and Conciliation in Indian Labour Law: Challenges and Prospects," 7 Asian Journal of Legal Studies 144 (2023).*

Reports and Government Documents

1. *Ministry of Labour & Employment, Report on the Functioning of Industrial Tribunals and Labour Courts in India (Gov't of India, 2021).*
2. *Law Commission of India, Report No. 222: Need for Justice through Mediation and Conciliation (2009).*
3. *Ministry of Law and Justice, Explanatory Note on the Mediation Act, 2023 (Gov't of India, 2023).*
4. *International Labour Organization (ILO), Conciliation and Mediation in Industrial Disputes: A Global Review (Geneva 2020).*

International Conventions and Guidelines

1. *International Labour Organization, Recommendation No. 92 on Voluntary Conciliation and Arbitration (1951).*
2. *International Labour Organization, Convention No. 154 on Collective Bargaining (1981).*
3. *United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL), Model Law on International Commercial Mediation (2018).*
4. *Singapore Convention on Mediation, Dec. 7, 2018, U.N. Doc. A/RES/73/198.*