**GRANT OF MINIMUM ENTRY PAY TO DIRECT RECRUITS IN A GRADE – FINANCE MINISTRY REPLIES IN A RTI APPLICATION**

**Relevant extract of notings in F.No. 10/2/2011-E-III(A) (Pt. File)**
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The previous note of the former JS(Per), as seen by the FM, relating to the two recommendations of the National Anomaly Committee (NAC) pertaining to (i) grant of minimum entry pay applicable to DRs in a grade in case of promotees in that grade and (ii) invocation of Rule 13 of the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008 in case of promotion from a grade to another grade involving assumption of higher functions but carrying the same Grade Pay, may kindly be glanced thorough.

2. The matter was discussed by the incumbent JS(Per) with the FS and the FM.

3. Subsequent to, and in the light of, the discussions JS(Per) had with the FS and the FM, the matter was further discussed by the undersigned with JS(Per), especially in regard to the first point relating to grant of minimum entry pay applicable to DRs in case of promotees.

4. During the discussions with JS(Per), it was noted that the concept of the minimum Entry Pay for a Direct Recruit has been specifically recommended by the 6th Pay Commission, which has been incorporated in Rule 8 of the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008. On the other hand, there is no such stipulation in case of promotees and, therefore, any measure to allow pay to a promote at a stage higher than what the normal rules for fixation of pay on promotion provide for, at par with the minimum Entry Pay in case of DR, needs to be considered having regard to whether an anomalous situation has occurred due to application of minimum entry pay for DRs resulting in a senior promotee drawing less pay. It was also noted that a plain and simple raising of the pay of a promotee to a level meant for a DR even, if no direct recruitment is actually in sight in a foreseeable future, as proposed based on the recommendations of the NAC, would require further examination in the light of the extant Rules for stepping up of pay and the actual instances of such instances of seniors drawing less pay than juniors.

Background of Entry Pay for Direct Recruits

5. The concept of a Entry Pay for DRs has been introduced for the first time based on the 6th Pay Commission’s recommendations. There was no such concept prior thereto. The reason why this concept has been recommended by the 6th CPC is because the Commission has recommended its pay structure with the novelty of Pay Bands and Grade Pays. This is a significant modification upon the earlier structure where each post used to be assigned with a specific pay scale It was the pay scale that used to define the functional status of a post.

6. On the other hand, the concept of Pay Band as introduced based on the 6th Pay Commission amalgamates within it a number of pre-revised scales of pay and, hence, anumber of posts including higher and lower’ posts in the same hierarchy, are now in the same Pay Band. In one Pay band, there falls a number of Grade Pays, which is again a concept introduced by the 6th PC. It is the Grade Pay that corresponds to a specific pre-revised scale of pay. Thus, what functional level a post used to be identified with in terms of a pie-revised scale, is now identified with a Grade Pay.

No occasion of DR drawing higher pay than a senior promotee in pre-revised set up

7. In view of a specific scale of pay attached to a specific post in the pre- revised structure, a DR used to get pay fixed at the minimum Of the scale of pay. For example, a DR joining as an Assistant or a PA in the central Secretariat, used to get his pay fixed at the minimum of the pre-revised cale of Rs. 5500
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(scale being Rs.5500-9000 prior to 15.9.2006). The immediate lower grade was that of UDC in the pre-revised scale of Rs.4000-100-6000- a span of 20-years). Thus, a person promoted as Assistant after the minimum prescribed service of 8 years would have got his pay fixed under the FR 22(1)(a)(I) and if the pay so arrived at was lower than Rs.5500/- , pay would be fixed at the minimum of Rs.5500.

The reason for introduction of Entry Pay in case of DRs by the 6th CPC

8. However, now that there is no specific pay scale, but a Pay Band which is a replacement of a group of pre-revised scales of pay and, thus, if a DR takes place not in the lower strata of Grade Pay in that Pay Band, then of course the pay could not be fixed at the minimum of the Pay Band. For example, the DR in the Assistant/PA grade, attached with the Grade Pay of Rs.4600, cannot be fixed at the minimum of PB 2 of Rs. 9300-34800, because this Grade Pay applicable to an Assistant/PA is at the middle of the Pay Band.

9. In order to surmount the problem as to how to fix the minimum pay in case of a DR on a post attached with a specific Grade Pay but falling in a Pay Band encompassing the posts both below and above the post in question, the 6th Central Pay Commission in pare 2.2.22 (iv) recommended a procedure for fixation of pay of new recruits/DRs in the running pay band of Groups, viz, ‘A’, ‘B’ and ‘C’ to which the post belongs. The Commission recommended that the minimum qualifying service prescribed for movement from the first grade in the running band to the grade in which recruitment is being made, would be computed and, thereafter, one increment for every year of fixed qualifying service shall be provided on the sum total of the minimum of therunning pay band and the lowest Grade Pay in that pay band. The pay on joining shall be the stage so computed in the corresponding running pay band and additionally Grade Pay corresponding to the Grade in that running pay band shall be payable.

Accordingly, entry pay in the revised pay structure for Direct Recruits appointed on or after 1.1.2006 have been fixed in Section -2 of Part ‘A’ of the first schedule of the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008 as under:

Pay Band 1 Rs. 5200-20200

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Pay | Pay in the Pay Band | Total Pay( Basic Pay) |
| 1800 | 5200 | 7000 |
| 1900 | 5830 | 7730 |
| 2000 | 7510 | 9910 |
| 2800 | 8560 | 11360 |

Pay Band 2 (Rs. 9300-34800)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 4200 | 9300 | 3,500 |
| 4600 | 12540 | 17l40 |
| 4800 | 13350 | 18150 |

Pay Band 3 Rs. Rs.15 600-39100)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 5400 | 15,600 | 21,000 |
| 6600 | 18,750 | 25,350 |
| 7600 | 21,900 | 29,500 |

 Pay Band 4 (Rs. 37,400-67,000)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 8700 | 37400 | 46100 |
| 8900 | 40200 | 49100 |
| 10000 | 43000 | 53000 |

11 . If we take the example of an Assistant/PA of Central Secretariat ( PB 2 + GP of Rs.4600), the entry pay fixed in this case is Rs. 17140/- (pay of Rs. 12540 in P8-2 + GP of Rs. 4600/-). The pay in the Pay Band of Rs. 12540/- constitutes an increase of 34.8% over the minimum of the Pay and, ie.,
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Rs. 9300/-. Thus, a little over 11 increments ( 3% each) have been taken into account for fixing the entry pay of Rs.17140 in this case.

12. The exact basis as to how a little over 11 increments have been taken in this case or how exactly the Entry Pay has been fixed in all the above cases, is not known, as the papers where the approval was taken or fixation of entry pay do not throw any light as to how the minimum pay had exactly been arrived at.

13. It is also pertinent to take note that as per the Pay Commission’s recommendations, the entry pay is to be fixed allowing one increment for every year of service prescribed for movement from the first grade in the running pay band to the grade of DR. However, In PB-2, where the post of Assistant/PA falls, the first grade is that corresponding to the Grade Pay of Rs. 4200/-. However, the feeder grade for Assistants is that of UDCs which falls in the PB-1 with a grade pay of Rs. 2400/-. Therefore, what factors weighed for arriving at this Entry Pay, or for that matter any Entry Pay, are not discernible from papers available with the Section, where the approval of the COS and the Cabinet was obtained for implementing the recommendations of the 6th CPC.

Why a DR may draw higher pay than a senior promote in the revised set up

14. Be that as it may, however, the fact remains that Entry pay in various grades where Direct Recruits takes place, have been provided for in the CCS (RP) Rules. This has resulted in Entry Pay of a DR happening to be higher than the pay of a promotee fixed in that grade under normal rules for fixating of pay on promotion. A few of the examples of this type are as under:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Post | Pay Bandand GradePay | Entry Pay ofa DR | Pay Fixed in case of promote |
| Assistant | PB2 + GP ofRs.4600 | Rs. 17,410 | Rs.14,430 (promoted on 17.8.2010) |
| PA | -do- | Rs.17,410 | Rs.15,050 (promoted on 21.6.2011) |
| IT Inspector | -do- | Rs.17,410 | Rs.16,010 (promoted on 25.5.2012) |
| It is not known, though, if the concerned promotee is senior to the DR or not. |

Cases of Constables and Head Constables of Delhi Police

15. During the processing of this case, the following two examples in the category of Constables & Head Constables of Delhi Police with a senior drawing less pay than a Junior due to the application of the Rule of Entry Pay of a DR, have also come to the fore, which even led to litigation in the Principal Bench of the CAT. In this case, the seniors were DRs appointed prior to 1.1.2006 and juniors as DR appointed after 1.1.2006. The position is as under:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Post | Pay Bandand GradePay | Entry Payof aSeniorDR after1.1.06 | Pay Fixed incase of thoseappointedbefore 1.1.06 | CAT Ruling |
| Constable | PB 1 + GP Rs.2000 | Rs. 8460 | Less than Rs.8460 | Order dt. 11.7.2011 in OA No.1924/2010. Pay to be fixed having regard to all aspects. That is, Pay to be stepped up. |
| HeadConstable | PB1 + GP Rs.2400 | Rs.9910 | Less thanRs.9910 | -do- |
| HeadConstable | PB 1+ GPRs.2400 | Rs.9910 | Rs.9460/- | Order dt. 31.8.2012 in OA No. 3715/2011. —Stepping up of pay at par with other Head Constables allowed. |

Page -20-

General principles for rectifying the anomaly of junior drawing more Pay than seniors

16. The fundamental principles for stepping up of pay for rectifying an anomaly arising out of the senior drawing less pay than a junior are as under:

(i) The Senior should have drawn more or equal pay than the junior in the lower grade too,

(ii) The Senior should draw less pay than the junior in the Grade in question and

(iii)The anomaly should have arisen due to application of FR 22 1(a)(1) — the principle of fixation of pay on promotion. (Rule 13 of the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008 now govern the fixation of pay on promotion).

17. This principle of stepping up of pay envisages an occurrence of an actual anomaly where the actual pay of a senior is less than that of a junior and anomaly takes place in the event of promotion from a lower grade to a higher grade.

Actual cases of anomaly due to operation of DR Entry pay considered in the Department of Expenditure

18. In view of the introduction of the concept of the Pay Bands ( comprising a number of pre-revised scales) and the Grade Pay specific to a post the fixation of an Entry Pay to a DR resulted in seniors drawing less pay than Junior DR appointed after 1.1.2006. A few of such cases of actual anomalous situation were referred to this Department.

19. In all such references, this Department has allowed stepping up of pay of the senior to the level that of the junior. The conditions under which this stepping up of pay have been allowed are as under:-

(a) Stepping up of the pay of seniors can be claimed only in the case of those cadres which have an element of direct recruitment and in cases where a directly recruited junior is actually drawing more basic pay than the seniors. In such cases, the basic pay of the seniors will be stepped up with reference to the pay of the directly recruited junior provided they belong to the same seniority list for all purposes.

(b) Government servants cannot claim stepping up of their revised basic pay with reference to the entry pay in the revised structure for direct recruits appointed on or after 1.1.2006, as laid down in Section 11 of Part A of the First Schedule to the CCS (RP) Rules, 2008, if their cadre does not have an element of direct recruitment or in cases here no junior is drawing basic pay higher than them.

(c) Stepping up of pay of the seniors shall not be applicable in cases where direct recruits have been granted advance increments at the time of recruitment.

The decision of the National Anomaly Committee

20. During the meeting of the NAC on 17.7.2012 it was informed by the official side that in cases where a senior appointed on promotion basis to a post draws less pay than a junior DR,stepping up of pay has been allowed by this Ministry in individual cases received from various quarters, subject to the conditions as mentioned above in para 19 above.

21. However, Staff side requested that in cases where recruitment Rules provide for Direct Recruitment, then the stepping up of pay of senior may be considered, even if no actual direct recruitment takes place or no DR has actually joined. The official side opined that wherever ‘there is a provision of direct recruitment in the Recruitment Rules, pay on promotion in case of promotees would be fixed at the prescribed minimum of the entry pay as provided for the DR in the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008, irrespective of the fact whether Direct Recruitment has actually taken place or not. The Staff side agreed to close this issue thereafter.

21.1 Thus, the decision of the NAC dt. 17.7.2012 covers cases where recruitment Rules provide for Direct Recruitment, then the stepping up of pay of senior may be considered, even if no actual direct recruitment takes place or no DR has actually joined.

Examination of the NAC decision

22. An anomaly occurs in the pay of a senior, if the actual pay of a junior happens to be higher than the actual pay of a senior due to application of either FRs or CCS(RP) Rules. If the pay of ajunior DR due to the concept of Entry Pay contained in CCS(RP) Rules, 2008, becomes higher than that of a senior not covered by this Entry Pay concept, then it becomes a clear case of anomaly and has been rectified too, as mentioned in para 19 above.

However, if the pay of a senior has not become actually lower than any junior whatsoever for the reasons that no direct recruitment has taken place or no DR has actually joined, no anomaly in the strict sense of the term could be deemed to have occurred. Therefore, the decision of the NAC for allowing pay of a person not directly covered under the Entry Pay concept at par with the Entry pay meant for DRs, irrespective of an actual anomaly having taken place, essentially amounts to extending the principle of Entry pay meant for Direct Recruits even in case of promotees, and , thus, practically giving a higher start to promotees on promotion to a grade where direct recruitment has been prescribed as a mode of recruitment. This amounts to relaxation of the principles of stepping up of pay because actual determration of “seniority versus juniority” in such cases may not be made for sure due simply to reason that a DR is yet to join and what the complexion of seniority or juniority will be, as and when a DR joins, is still in the realm of possibility. Therefore, this decision of the NAC will practically be implemented independent of the issue of “senior versus junior” purely on the principle that the benefit of entry pay meant for DRs is to be extended across the board to all those appointed on promotion.

24. Accordingly, there are appears to be both pros and cons the decision of the NAC, as brought out below:-

Pros of the decision of the NAC:

i. The level of a minimum entry pay for a post tends to reflect the level of duties and responsibilities assigned to that post. Thus, if a level of pay has been assigned to a new recruit, the fair play demands that the same level be attached to an entrant to that post through promotion route too. For, both DR and promotee are required to perform their functions in an
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equal measure and promotees are not supposed to fare a shade lower than DRs. Therefore, if the pay prescribed for DRs at the time of entry is such as is higher than the pay fixed in case of the promotees under the normal rules of fixation of pay, it may amount to creating an unfair distinction between DRs and promotees.

ii. Since the decision has been taken in the NAC, where both official and staff sides were present, the balance appears to lie in going along with the decision.

iii. The CAT in its order dt. 31.8.2012 in the OA No. 3718/…., while basically ordering stepping up of pay of the concerned Head Constable, who was so appointed before 1.1.2006, at par with the Entry pay of DR Head Constable appointed after 1.1.2006, has also observed in its operative part of the order that just because no DR has joined in the cadre of the petitioner, it is not a good ground to deny him the benefit. This order does portend how a Court of Law is likely to be disposed toward judicial determination, if litigation is resorted to for carrying out the decision of the NAC.

Cons of the decision of the NAC

i. First and foremost, the Government has not foreclosed the option of Stepping up of pay, if an anomaly happens in the form of a senior promotee drawing less pay than a junior Direct Recruit. This being so end the solution to occurrence of an anomaly existing, a blanket raising of pay in case of promotees , even if no direct recruitment has taken place or no actual anomaly has resulted as a consequence of a DR joining, may not be appropriate, as it will amount to raising -the pay without any actual provocation in disregard of the fixation of pay rules on promotion.

ii. if a blanket raising of pay of promotees in such cases is allowed, despite DR not taking place and no anomaly cropping up, it will create an unfair distinction vis-a-vis incumbents of the analogous/comparable posts where there is no element direct recruitment. For example, in respect of post in Grade Pay of Rs. 4600/- where there is no direct Recruitment, the benefit of entry pay will not be admissible and this may create grudge and the consequent demands for parity on the ground that there is parity in the Grade Pay and route of entry is promotion. Since the Grade Pay generally provides an indication of the level of “work’, any distinction in the minimum entry pay in respects of two different posts merely on the ground that one post has an element of direct recruitment and other post does not, may not be a fair distinction and may be treated as discriminatory based on the principle of “equal pay for equal work. It is difficult a prognosis to make as to how such demands will pan out and what the response of Courts of Law would be, if litigation is restored to by disgruntled employees.

iii. A blanket raising of pay of promotees to the level of entry pay meant for DRs will mean a general raising of minimum pay in all those grades where there is an element of direct recruitment. This obviously raises the issue of financial implications. However, there is no statistical data with us as to how much the financial implications would be in such a case DR element exists in various grades and it is bound to entail substantial implications.

Conclusion:

25. Based on the above, it is apparent that it is a tough call to make whether to go along with the decision of the NAC or not, as it seems to be suffused with arguments both for and against on an even keel. Thus, the following two options are submitted for consideration:-

(i) In view of the fact that the NAC decision allows a solution which provides for a benefit even without actual occurrence of an actual anomaly, as also having regard to the arguments against this decision as mentioned in para 24 above, it appears difficult to act upon this decision of the NAC. Therefore, the decision taken by us in individual cases for stepping up of pay to the level of entry pay of DRs in the event of occurrence of an actual anomaly, may now be formalized by way of a general order. This will not cover the exact decision of the NAC, but will be in line with the ratio of that decision to take care of the actual anomalous situation. This benefit will take effect from the date of occurrence of the anomaly, as this is an actual anomaly and will require to be rectified from the date of occurrence, even if retrospective effect is involved. This is how the individual cases were dealt with by this Department. A draft OM as DFA 1A is placed below on this option. Such

or

(ii) Keeping in view the arguments for the decision of the NAC, as mentioned in para 24 above, we may allow the Entry meant for the DRs appointed after 1.1.2006 to those promoted to the same grade, if the Entry pay happens to be higher than the pay fixed in case of promotees. This would be fully in accordance with the decision of the National Anomaly Committee. Since this is based on the principal of a financial concession and not on actual occurrence of an anomaly, such a benefit may be given notional benefit from the date of appointment of an employee on promotion and actual benefit from the date of issue of orders if such a benefit is admissible from a date earlier than the date of issue of orders. A draft OM at DFA 1 B is placed below for this option.

26. So far as the other issue of the NAC decision, relating to invocation of Rule 13 of the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008 in case of promotion from a grade to another grade involving assumption of higher functions but carrying the same Grade Pay, is concerned, the DFA ll already submitted vide note of p 16/n/ante , is also for approval. This is an issue which is justified and is line with the practice adopted after the 5th CPC too.

27. Paras 25 and 26 are submitted for consideration and approval.

(Amar nath Singh)

DS(E-IIIA)

23.11.2012

(JS/Pers.)
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Notes at pages 17-23/N refer.

The National Anomalies Committee (NAC) in its meeting of 17.07.2012 made two recommendations:

(i) Grant of ‘minimum entry pay’ applicable to Direct recruits in a grade in case of promotees in that grade: and

(ii) Invocation of Rule. 13 of the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008 n case of promotion from a grade to another grade involving assumption of higher functions but carrying the same Grade Pay.

2 The issue under discussion relates to recommendation at or fixation of pay for promoted officers with reference to the “minimum entry pay” applicable to DRs in the same Grade. Earlier this regard may be seen at page 16/N, after which the matter was discussed by FS and the undersigned with the Hon’ble FM. On reexamination of the issue, the position that emerges is detailed below.

3. The notion of “minimum entry pay” for DRs is a new concept introduced by the 6th Central Pay Commission (CPC). Prior to the 6th CPC’s, DRs were fitted at the minimum of the scale of pay applicable to the Grade in which they were recruited. The 6th CPC, however, merged the pay scales at certain levels and introduced the concept of Pay Band and Grade Pay to distinguish between the hierarchy of posts sitting within a particular Pay Band. While the pay scales have been merged into Pay Bands, the hierarchy of posts has continued to exist. As a result thereof, if direct recruitment takes place for a certain post which is above the minimum of the Pay Band, the pay can obviously not be fixed at the minimum of the Pay Band. For example, the direct recruitment in the Assistant/Personal Assistant Grade with Grade Pay of Rs.4600 cannot be fixed at the minimum of Pay Band-2 of Rs.9300-34800 because the Grade Pay of Rs.4600 is at the middle of the Pay Band as illustrated in Table below:-

Pay Band-2 (Rs.9300-34800)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Grade Pay(in Rs.) | Pay in the PayBand(in Rs.) | Total(In Rs.) |
| 4,200 | 9,300 | 13,500 |
| 4,600 | 12,540 | 17,140 |
| 4,800 | 13,350 | 18,150 |

4. To overcome this problem, the 6th CPC recommended the concept of “minimum entry pay” for DRs, providing a normative basis for matching the
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pay with the level at which the recruitment takes place. The procedure prescribed in the 6th CPC. for calculating the entry pay for DRs is explained at pa a 9, 10 & 11 at pages 18-19/N. The result of this methodology is that in certain situations, the entry pay of a DR could be higher than the pay of a promotee fixed in that Grade. Some examples of such cases are available t able given at para 14 at page 19/N.

5. This Department has received references of certain cases of anomaly where promoted seniors actually drew less pay than junior DRs (eg. Constables, Income Tax Assistant). In all these cases the Department allowed stepping up of pay of the seniors to the level of the Junior subject to the condition that:-

i) DR junior is actually drawing higher basic pay than the senior;

ii) The cadre should have an element of DR;

iii) Stepping up will not be applicable in cases where DRs were granted advance increments atthe time of recruitment.

6. Later, based on requests from the staff side it was agreed at a meeting of the NAC in July, 2012 that such stepping up of the pay of the senior may be considered even if no actual direct recruitment takes place or no actual DR has actually joined. Arguments for and against the decision of the NAC may be perused at para 24 at page 21-22/N.

7. It appears difficult to accept the arguments in favour of the decision of the NAC on account of the following:-

(a) Setting right of an anomaly can take place only after an anomaly actually arises. If no direct recruitment has taken place and no anomaly has therefore resulted, giving the benefit of an increase in pay amounts to giving a benefit not admissible under the normal pay rules. This could potentially lead to a further anomalous situation vis-a-vis comparable posts where no element of direct recruitment is provided for in the RR, but where the nature of work is similar.

(b) The recommendation of the NAC is to increase the pay of a promotee even where no direct recruitment has taken place but where the RRs prescribe an element of direct recruitment, suggesting the setting right of a perceived disparity between pay of a direct recruit and a promotee.
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It would however, be necessary to view this recommendation in the larger context-of the 6th CPC’s conscious movement from multiple pay scales to rationalisation of the pay structure by way of Pay Bands and Grade Pay and the consequent introduction of a new concept of “entry pay”. While it is possible that this may have resulted in a situation where in certain cases, the procedure for calculating “entry pay” for DRs could result in the “entry pay” being higher than the pay fixed for senior promoted officers in the same grade, this problem would be rectified on the basis of this Departments’ decision indicated at para 5 above.

(c) We also have no data with us at the moment as to possible financial implications if we agree to the recommendation of the NAC.

8. Under the circumstances, it is suggested that we may not accept this recommendation of the NAC and continue with the earlier decision of permitting stepping up of pay only in cases where a junior DR is actually drawing higher basic pay than the senior under the conditions indicated; at para 5 above. However, we may accept the recommendation (ii) of the NAC which pertains to applicability of Rule 13 of the CCS(RP) Rules, 2008 in case of promotion from one post to another where both the posts are in same Grade Pay but one is a feeder grade and the other is a promotion grade, as this is only a continuation of the provisions of an O.M. issued by this Department on 24.11.2000. DFA-I in this regard is placed at F/A.

Submitted for consideration.

(Sudha Krishnan)

JS (Pers.)

17.12.2012

Finance Secretary

F. M.
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      Note of JS (Pers) may kindly be seen from page 24-26 ante The matter had been discussed with FM earlier. The proposal at ‘X’ on page 24 N (also ‘Y’ above) was agreed during discussion, for implementation. However, regarding the proposal at ‘Z’ on page 24 N, it had been desired that the matter may be re-examined in detail, even though it is a recommendation of the National Anomaly Committee (NAC); keeping in view the fact that implementation of the proposal may create unexpected complications in future. After detailed examination, it has been recommended by JS (Pers) at ‘A’ on page 26 N that we should not accept the said recommendation of the NAC, and that we should continue with the existing policy of permitting the stepping up of pay of senior promotee officers, only in cases where junior direct with recruit is actually drawing higher basic pay than the senior. I agree the above recommendation.

Submitted for consideration and approval of FM.

(R.S. Gujral)

FS & Secretary (E)