

Points of doubt raised and clarifications thereon

Sl. No	Point of doubt	Clarification
1.	Whether one increment of 3% constitute one stage or a difference of 3% among the pay of two officers constitute two stages.	As explained in this Ministry's earlier OM dated 3.8.2017, the stages of every pay scale were well defined in the pay structure under 5 th CPC regime and the stages were not well defined in the 6 th CPC structure. Since there were no defined stages in the 6 th CPC structure and as pay in the running Pay Band in the 6 th CPC structure could be of any amount in the multiple of Rs. 10, as specific to an employee, it has been very clearly brought out therein, drawing upon the illustration given by the 7 th Pay Commission in para 5.1.37 of its Report, that a difference of at least 3%, the rate of annual increment in the 6 th CPC structure, was essential for counting of two stages. Therefore, for the purpose of considering bunching, two Pays drawn in a Pay Band with a particular Grade Pay, which are separated by 3% of the lower pay, are to be taken into account, as explained in the illustration given in para 9(i) of this order.
2.	Whether the pay at Cell 1 of any Level may be taken as first stage.	Bunching is to be considered with reference to the consecutive stages of pay drawn in the pay structure obtaining prior to 1.1.2016, as explained in these orders, and as such a reference to Cell 1, which is in the revised pay structure, is not relevant.
3.	Whether all pay stages lower than the entry pay in the 6 th CPC pay structure are not to be taken into account for	This point has been amply clarified in the aforesaid OM dated 3.8.2017. As mentioned in para

	the purpose of bunching.	8(iv) thereof, all pay stages lower than the Entry Pay in the 6 th CPC pay structure as indicated in the Pay Matrix contained in 7 th CPC Report are not to be taken into account for determining the extent of bunching.
4.	Whether benefit of bunching should be given only where previous and current pay stages of the officers (specific to each employee) are getting bunched and placed at the same Level in the 7 th CPC matrix without any comparison to any other officer's pay as per para 5 and 8(iii) of this Department's OM dated 3.8.2017 which stipulates that a difference of 3% to be reckoned for determination of consecutive pay stages, specific to each employee	The position clarified in these orders covers this point. As explained in the illustration, the pre-revised pay of Rs.46,100 and Rs. 47,490 are considered two stages of pay, as these are separated by 3% and these could be drawn by any two officers.
5.	Whether benefit of bunching is to be given to a senior officer with reference to the pay of his junior officer who is drawing less pay with the difference of 3% to the senior officer and now his pay got fixed in the same Level as that of the senior officer.	The issue of bunching is not a matter of pay drawn by a Senior Officer vis-a-vis a Junior Officer. As explained in these orders, bunching happens as in the illustration given in these orders and as such this is not related to the issue of seniority.
6.	Whether the benefit of bunching is also required to be given to a senior officer where his junior's pay has got fixed in the same Cell as that of the senior due to the benefit of bunching of pay given to the junior.	
7.	Whether the benefit of bunching may be extended on account of bunching of two stages of pre-revised pay of a Government servant alone.	It is not clear how two stages drawn by a single Government servant are relevant for pay fixation on 1.1.2016, as only the pay drawn on 31.12.2015 is to be taken into account for pay fixation on 1.1.2016

8.	Whether the benefit of bunching may be extended only on direct pay fixation where the pay of two officers in the pre-revised pay with a difference of 3% get fixed at the same stage in the revised pay structure (7 th CPC) or also on further bunching with next higher pay stage due to grant of additional increment to an officer for bunching on initial/direct pay fixation.	As explained in the illustration contained in para 9(ii) of these orders, no such benefit is admissible in such cases.
----	--	--

