

From Fragmented Wage Bases to a Harmonised Concept of Wages: A Critical Study of the Four Labour Codes in India and the 50 Percent Add-Back Rule

Dr Gyan Prakash Mishra

VIT Bhopal University, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.51583/IJLTEMAS.2026.150900126>

Received: 20 September 2026; Accepted: 28 September 2026; Published: 19 October 2026

ABSTRACT

The consolidation of India's labour legislation into four Labour Codes marks a significant attempt to simplify and modernise the country's employment law framework. One of the most important features of this legislative exercise is the adoption of a substantially common definition of “wages” across the Code on Wages, 2019, the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, the Code on Social Security, 2020 and the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020. The reform seeks to address a longstanding problem under the earlier legal regime, where different labour statutes employed different definitions of wages, basic wages and related expressions for different statutory purposes.

The new framework has, however, generated considerable debate regarding the scope of the common definition, the treatment of allowances and the meaning of the statutory provision popularly described as the “50% rule.” A particularly widespread misunderstanding is that the Labour Codes require every employer to maintain basic pay at 50% of an employee's Cost to Company (CTC). This paper argues that such a formulation does not accurately reflect the statutory language. The first proviso to the definition of wages operates as an add-back mechanism: where payments falling under specified excluded heads exceed one-half of the relevant remuneration, the excess is deemed to be wages. The provision is therefore better understood as a statutory limitation on excessive exclusion of remuneration from the wage base rather than as a mandatory “50% basic pay formula.”

The paper examines the statutory architecture of the common definition, compares it with the fragmented approach under the pre-Code regime and analyses important judicial decisions, particularly *Bridge & Roof Co. (India) Ltd. v. Union of India* and *Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (II), West Bengal v. Vivekananda Vidyamandir*. It also examines the relationship between wages, minimum wages, statutory wage ceilings and the often misunderstood ₹18,000 threshold under the Industrial Relations Code. The study concludes that the principal contribution of the Labour Codes lies in creating a common starting point for wage determination, while the actual legal consequences continue to depend upon the particular substantive provision, scheme or statutory purpose involved.

Keywords: Wages, Labour Codes, Basic Pay, Dearness Allowance, Social Security, 50% Rule, Add-Back Rule, Provident Fund, Compensation Structuring, Labour Law Reform.

INTRODUCTION

The concept of wages lies at the heart of employment law. It affects not only what an employee receives for work performed but also how a range of statutory rights and obligations are calculated. Minimum wage protection, timely payment of wages, bonuses, provident fund contributions, gratuity, industrial compensation, and other employment-related benefits are all, directly or indirectly, connected to how remuneration is legally characterised.

Yet, historically, Indian labour law did not proceed from one common concept of wages. Different enactments used different definitions. The meaning of “wages” under one statute could differ from “basic

wages” under another. As a result, employers were often required to analyse the same salary structure differently for different legal purposes.

The four Labour Codes seek to substantially alter this position. The Code on Wages, 2019; the Industrial Relations Code, 2020; the Code on Social Security, 2020; and the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020 adopt a substantially common statutory framework for defining wages. The definition broadly begins with remuneration payable in respect of employment or work performed, expressly includes basic pay, dearness allowance and retaining allowance, identifies specific exclusions and incorporates an important proviso dealing with the treatment of specified excluded components exceeding one-half of the relevant remuneration.

This harmonisation is one of the most consequential features of the new labour law architecture. It seeks to move away from an Act-specific approach to wage determination towards a common legal foundation. The underlying policy concern appears to be that ordinary remuneration should not be fragmented excessively into different allowances merely to reduce the statutory wage base.

At the same time, the reform has produced several misconceptions. Perhaps the most common is the proposition that the Codes require basic pay to be fixed at 50% of CTC. Another is that a monetary threshold of ₹18,000 removes an employee earning more than that amount from the definition of wages or the 50% rule.

Neither proposition can be accepted without careful examination of the statutory provisions.

The first proposition confuses basic pay with the statutory calculation of wages. The second confuses a threshold used in defining certain supervisory employees as “workers” under the Industrial Relations Code with the general definition of wages.

This paper critically examines these issues. Its central argument is that the reform must be understood in two stages. First, wages must be determined under the common statutory definition. Second, the particular operative provision must be examined to determine the consequence of that wage determination.

Thus, the important legal principle emerging from the Labour Codes is not that all employment-related calculations have become identical. Rather, the reform establishes a common starting point while preserving purpose-specific statutory consequences.

Research Objectives

The study has the following objectives:

1. To examine the statutory definition of wages under the four Labour Codes.
2. To identify the principal similarities and differences among the four definitions.
3. To analyse the legal nature and operation of the 50% add-back rule.
4. To distinguish between basic pay, statutory wages, gross remuneration and CTC.
5. To distinguish the definition of wages from minimum wage levels and statutory wage ceilings.
6. To analyse the legal relevance of the ₹18,000 threshold under the Industrial Relations Code.
7. To examine leading judicial decisions concerning wages and basic wages.
8. To assess the likely implications of the new framework for employers, employees, social security institutions and payroll administration.
9. To identify areas in which further judicial or administrative clarification may be necessary.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The present study adopts a doctrinal and analytical methodology. It relies primarily on secondary sources.

The primary legal materials examined include:

- the Code on Wages, 2019;
- the Industrial Relations Code, 2020;
- the Code on Social Security, 2020;
- the Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020;
- official material and clarifications issued by the Ministry of Labour and Employment; and
- reported decisions of the Supreme Court of India.

Secondary materials include scholarly articles, legal commentaries, and analyses on the transition from the earlier labour law framework to the four Labour Codes. Recent academic literature has also recognised that the common definition of wages is one of the important features of the Codes, while the broader impact of the Codes must be understood in relation to the different sectors and categories of employment covered by them (see, e.g., the analysis published in *Cogent Social Sciences*, 2023).

The research is qualitative in nature. It does not involve a primary survey, questionnaire or empirical sample. The emphasis is on statutory interpretation, legal history, judicial reasoning and practical implications for compensation administration.

The Earlier Legal Regime: Why Harmonisation Became Necessary

Before the enactment of the Labour Codes, India's labour law system consisted of many individual statutes enacted at different times for different purposes. This resulted in multiple approaches to the concept of wages. Som (2022), Mani et al. (2021), and Ramaswamy and Binnuri (2023) also discuss the historical fragmentation of labour-law definitions.

For example, the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 used the expression "basic wages." The Payment of Wages Act, 1936 used its own definition of wages. The Minimum Wages Act, 1948 and other welfare enactments operated within their respective statutory frameworks.

This diversity had significant consequences.

The same employee could have:

- one wage base for provident fund purposes;
- another for bonus;
- another for gratuity;
- another for minimum wage compliance; and
- yet another for industrial compensation.

This did not necessarily mean that the earlier legislation was internally defective. Different statutes were enacted for different purposes, and different definitions could therefore be justified. Nevertheless, from an

administrative perspective, the result was considerable complexity.

Salary structuring also became increasingly sophisticated. Compensation packages could contain numerous components, including basic pay, dearness allowance, house rent allowance, conveyance allowance, special allowance, medical allowance, professional allowance, incentives and reimbursements.

The question frequently arose whether the nomenclature assigned to a payment was decisive.

The Supreme Court's jurisprudence gradually established that statutory consequences cannot necessarily be avoided merely by changing the name of a component. The real nature of the payment, its universality, its conditions and the wording of the relevant statute became important.

The common definition under the Labour Codes should therefore be viewed against this background. The reform attempts to reduce definitional fragmentation and discourage excessive structuring of ordinary remuneration through multiple exclusions.

The background materials forming the basis of the present study similarly identify this transition as a movement from multiple statutory wage concepts towards an integrated compensation framework, while cautioning that a uniform definition should not be mistaken for identical consequences under every statute.

The Common Definition of Wages Under the Four Labour Codes

The relevant provisions are: The statutory texts establish this substantially harmonised structure (Government of India, 2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c).

Labour Code	Relevant Provision
Code on Wages, 2019	Section 2(y)
Industrial Relations Code, 2020	Section 2(zq)
Code on Social Security, 2020	Section 2(88)
Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020	Section 2(zzj)

The statutory provisions are substantially harmonised. The basic structure may be understood through four elements:

1. A broad opening definition of remuneration;
2. Express inclusion of specified components;
3. Specific statutory exclusions; and
4. Provisos dealing with the 50% add-back mechanism and remuneration in kind.

Broad Meaning of Remuneration

The definition begins with remuneration payable in money or capable of being expressed in money, payable to a person employed in respect of employment or work done, subject to the fulfilment of the terms of employment.

This broad formulation is important. It means that the statutory analysis does not begin and end with basic pay.

The legal question is wider: what remuneration is payable in respect of employment, and how is each component treated under the definition?

Components Expressly Included

The definition expressly includes:

- basic pay;
- dearness allowance; and
- retaining allowance, if any.

These components therefore form the clear statutory core of wages.

However, it would still be incorrect to conclude that wages are limited exclusively to these three components. The statutory definition begins with remuneration generally and then operates through inclusions, exclusions and provisos.

The more accurate conceptual formulation is:

Statutory Wages = Qualifying Remuneration, subject to express exclusions and the applicable statutory add-back provisions.

The materials supplied for this research similarly identify basic pay, dearness allowance and retaining allowance as the common statutory core while emphasising that the complete legal exercise requires consideration of exclusions and the 50% proviso.

Statutory Exclusions

The definition identifies several payments excluded from the statutory scheme.

Broadly, these include:

1. specified bonus payments;
2. the value of house accommodation, amenities and services covered by the provision;
3. employer contributions to pension or provident fund and accrued interest;
4. conveyance allowance or travelling concession;
5. reimbursement of special expenses incurred because of the nature of employment;
6. house rent allowance;
7. remuneration payable under an award, settlement or order of a court or Tribunal;
8. overtime allowance;
9. commission;
10. gratuity payable upon termination of employment; and
11. specified retrenchment, retirement and termination-related payments.

The exclusions demonstrate that the definition is carefully structured.

A payment may be remuneration in an ordinary sense and still be excluded for the purpose of the statutory

definition. Equally, the mere fact that an employer calls a payment an “allowance” does not automatically determine its legal position.

The classification has to be undertaken by reference to the statute. This distinction between the legal character of a component and the label attached to it is central to the interpretation of the Labour Codes.

The 50% Add-Back Rule: A Cap on Exclusions, Not A Mandatory Basic Pay Formula

The most widely discussed part of the new definition is the first proviso, generally described as the “50% rule.” The expression is convenient, but it has also led to substantial misunderstanding.

What the Provision Does

The statutory mechanism requires an examination of the aggregate of the payments falling within the specified excluded heads referred to in the proviso. Where those payments exceed one-half, or such other percentage as may be notified by the Central Government, of the relevant remuneration calculated under the definition, the excess is deemed to be remuneration and added back into wages.

The official Ministry FAQs describe this mechanism in substantially the same manner. They state that where allowances and benefits covered by the relevant framework exceed 50% of remuneration, subject to the statutory treatment of gratuity and retrenchment compensation, the excess is added back to wages for statutory purposes. (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2025, 2026) [Labour Government of India](#)

The March 2026 Additional FAQs provide further clarification on questions concerning overtime, statutory contributions and the calculation of remuneration for applying the rule. (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2025, 2026) [Labour Government of India](#)

What the Provision Does Not Do

The provision does **not** expressly say:

- Basic Pay must always be equal to 50% of CTC.
- Nor does it state: Every salary structure must contain Basic Pay and DA equal to exactly 50% of the employee's CTC.

These formulations are simplifications created in practical discussions of salary restructuring. They may sometimes produce a structure that avoids an add-back, but they should not be confused with the statutory text.

The law concerns the aggregate treatment of relevant exclusions. This distinction can be illustrated as follows.

Assume:

- Total relevant remuneration: ₹100,000;
- Basic Pay + DA + Retaining Allowance: ₹30,000;
- Relevant excluded components covered by the proviso: ₹70,000.

If the permitted exclusion level is one-half, the relevant excluded components exceed ₹50,000 by ₹20,000.

Accordingly, the excess ₹20,000 is deemed to be wages.

The resulting wage figure for the purpose of the definition would be:

$\text{₹}30,000 + \text{₹}20,000 = \text{₹}50,000$.

This is not because the statute directly ordered the employer to fix basic pay at ₹50,000. It is because the statutory add-back mechanism prevents the relevant exclusions from reducing the wage base beyond the prescribed level.

The most appropriate description, therefore, is:

The 50% rule is an anti-fragmentation or cap-on-exclusions mechanism, not a universal 50% basic pay formula.

This interpretation is also consistent with recent professional legal analysis that describes the provision as a cap on exclusions rather than a ceiling on basic pay (Chopra & Sharma, 2026). [Chambers](#)

The source materials used in preparing this paper reach the same practical conclusion: organisations should not artificially redesign their compensation structure merely to achieve a “50% Basic Pay” figure but should undertake a component-wise legal analysis of the full remuneration package.

Which Exclusions Matter For the 50% Calculation?

This is a technically important issue. The first proviso does not simply say that every item excluded from wages must be aggregated and subjected to the 50% threshold in exactly the same manner.

The statutory language specifically identifies the relevant exclusions for the calculation. Therefore, each component must first be classified according to the relevant clause before the mathematical exercise is undertaken.

For practical purposes, employers may divide remuneration into three broad categories:

Category I: Components Directly Forming Part of Wages

These include the expressly included components, such as:

- Basic Pay;
- Dearness Allowance; and
- Retaining Allowance.

Category II: Excluded Components Relevant to the 50% Add-Back Exercise

These are the specified excluded heads covered by the first proviso. Their aggregate must be examined against the statutory threshold.

Category III: Separately Excluded Terminal or Retirement-Related Payments

Certain payments, including gratuity payable upon termination and specified retrenchment, retirement or ex gratia payments, require treatment according to their own statutory position and should not casually be merged into an ordinary allowance calculation.

This is an area where recent official clarification is especially valuable. The Ministry's Additional FAQs expressly distinguish statutory components such as employer PF and pension contributions from gratuity, ESI and other retirement benefits for purposes of the questions raised regarding the calculation.

Therefore, the correct organisational approach is not to use one generic “allowance” basket. Each component should be legally classified before applying the 50% test.

Wages, Basic Pay, Gross Salary and Ctc Are Not Synonymous

One of the major practical difficulties in discussing the Labour Codes is the casual use of different expressions as though they mean the same thing.

They do not.

Basic Pay

Basic Pay is a component of remuneration and is expressly included in the statutory definition of wages.

Statutory Wages

Statutory wages must be determined under the relevant definition, including the treatment of inclusions, exclusions and the add-back mechanism.

Gross Salary

Gross salary is generally an employment or payroll expression representing the employee's remuneration before applicable deductions. Its exact composition may vary by organisation.

It is not automatically synonymous with statutory wages.

Cost to Company

CTC is largely a commercial and compensation-management concept. It may include components that are not paid directly as monthly cash salary, such as employer contributions and other employment costs.

The statutory definition of wages does not simply equate wages with CTC.

Accordingly, the statement that “wages must be 50% of CTC” is not an accurate substitute for the statutory exercise.

The first step must always be to identify what constitutes remuneration and how each component is treated under the applicable legal provision.

The ₹18,000 Issue: A Threshold for “Worker” Status, Not a General Wage Ceiling

The ₹18,000 figure has generated a particularly important misunderstanding.

Under the Industrial Relations Code, 2020, the definition of “worker” excludes a person employed in a supervisory capacity who draws wages exceeding ₹18,000 per month, or such other amount as may be notified, subject to the other requirements of the definition.

This threshold relates to one part of the legal test for determining whether a supervisory employee falls within the definition of “worker.” The provision must be read as part of the definition of worker.

It does **not** mean that:

1. the Code on Wages applies only to employees earning up to ₹18,000;
2. employees earning more than ₹18,000 are outside the common definition of wages; or
3. the 50% add-back rule ceases to apply merely because remuneration exceeds ₹18,000.

The Industrial Relations Code itself separately contains the common definition of wages. Its statutory text therefore distinguishes between the definition of wages and the definition of worker. The ₹18,000 figure appears in the context of the latter. (Government of India, 2020a) [India Code](#)

This clearly shows why definitions must be read in their statutory context.

A monetary threshold used for determining whether a particular category of supervisory employee is a “worker” cannot automatically be converted into a general exemption from the definition of wages.

This distinction is fundamental to a correct understanding of the Labour Codes.

Wages, Minimum Wages and Wage Ceilings: Three Separate Legal Concepts

Another source of confusion is the tendency to treat wages, minimum wages, and scheme-specific wage ceilings as interchangeable. The Ministry of Labour & Employment (2026) expressly distinguishes wages from minimum wages.

They are legally distinct.

Statutory Wages

This refers to the wage figure determined according to the relevant statutory definition.

Minimum Wages

Minimum wages represent the minimum level of remuneration prescribed or notified under the applicable statutory framework.

The fact that an employee earns more than a prescribed minimum wage does not automatically take the employee outside the statutory definition of wages.

Wage Ceilings

Certain social security schemes may contain separate wage ceilings or thresholds for eligibility, coverage or contributions.

Such a ceiling has to be read with the scheme and the relevant statutory provision.

The existence of a wage ceiling under a particular scheme should not be confused with the definition of wages under the Labour Codes.

The legal sequence is generally:

First: determine the wage figure under the applicable definition.

Second: examine whether a particular scheme or statutory provision imposes a ceiling, threshold or other condition.

The materials provided for the present research similarly stress the need to distinguish the common wage definition from the specific statutory consequences under the Social Security Code, Industrial Relations Code, or Code on Wages.

Judicial Development of the Concept of Wages

Earlier jurisprudence remains relevant to understanding the legal background against which the Labour Codes

were enacted.

However, earlier cases were decided under earlier statutory definitions. Their conclusions cannot automatically be transplanted into the new Codes where the statutory wording differs.

Their continuing relevance lies primarily in their interpretative principles and historical significance.

Bridge & Roof Co. (India) Ltd. V. Union Of India

In *Bridge & Roof Co. (India) Ltd. v. Union of India*, AIR 1963 SC 1474, the Supreme Court considered whether production bonus could be included in “basic wages” under the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952.

The Court considered the definition's broad opening language and the specific statutory exclusions (*Bridge & Roof Co. v. Union of India*, 1963). It concluded that the exclusions must be given full effect. Production bonus could not be brought within basic wages merely because it could be regarded in a general sense as part of the price of labour.

The decision is significant because it demonstrates an important principle of statutory interpretation:

A broad definition must be read together with its exclusions. The Court recognised that the statutory definition and its exceptions form one integrated legal scheme.

This principle remains useful in interpreting the Labour Codes. The common definition cannot be understood by reading only the opening words or only the inclusive clause. The exclusions and provisos are equally important.

Manipal Academy of Higher Education V. Provident Fund Commissioner

In *Manipal Academy of Higher Education v. Provident Fund Commissioner*, (2008) 5 SCC 428, the Supreme Court considered issues concerning special allowances and provident fund liability under the earlier legal regime.

The case forms part of the continuing judicial debate regarding the distinction between basic wages and other allowances (*Manipal Academy of Higher Education v. Provident Fund Commissioner*, 2008) and demonstrates the difficulty that arose under the earlier fragmented framework.

Its significance for present purposes is primarily historical. It illustrates why questions relating to the nomenclature and legal nature of allowances became recurring subjects of litigation.

Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (Ii), West Bengal V. Vivekananda Vidyamandir

A particularly significant modern judgment is *Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (II), West Bengal v. Vivekananda Vidyamandir*, (2019) 4 SCC 556.

The Supreme Court considered whether certain special allowances paid to employees should be included in the relevant wage base for provident fund contributions (*Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (II), West Bengal v. Vivekananda Vidyamandir*, 2019).

The Court reiterated the importance of examining whether payments were universally, ordinarily and necessarily paid to employees. The Court could not determine the legal character of the payment merely by its nomenclature. Payments genuinely linked to special circumstances or additional output could stand on a different footing from allowances that were, in substance, ordinary and universal components of remuneration.

The decision's importance lies in its emphasis on **substance over nomenclature**.

This principle has obvious relevance to the policy underlying the Labour Codes. The new 50% add-back mechanism addresses, through statutory design, the concern that excessive fragmentation of remuneration into excluded heads may artificially reduce the wage base.

The earlier judicial tests should not be treated as replacing the statutory language of the Codes. Nevertheless, the case provides important historical context for understanding the reform.

Continuing Relevance of Judicial Precedent

The Labour Codes may generate their own body of case law. Courts will have to interpret the precise language of the new provisions.

Earlier decisions remain relevant as interpretative background, but the new statutory text must prevail.

Therefore, the appropriate legal approach is:

1. Read the wording of the relevant Labour Code.
2. Apply its inclusions, exclusions and provisos.
3. Use earlier case law only to the extent that the statutory language and legal issue permit.

Uniform Definition Does Not Mean Uniform Legal Consequences

This is perhaps the most important conclusion emerging from the comparative study of the four Codes. This distinction follows from reading the four Codes together with their respective operative provisions (Government of India, 2019, 2020a, 2020b, 2020c).

The definition of wages is substantially harmonised. The purposes for which wages are used are not identical.

Under the **Code on Wages, 2019**, the definition operates within the framework of wage rights, including payment and minimum wage protection.

Under the **Industrial Relations Code, 2020**, wages become relevant to industrial relations and compensation-related provisions.

Under the **Code on Social Security, 2020**, the concept is relevant to the statutory framework governing social security contributions and benefits.

Under the **Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020**, the definition operates wherever the Code applies the expression within its own statutory framework.

The correct legal methodology is therefore a two-stage exercise.

Stage One: Determine the Statutory Wage Figure

The entire remuneration package must be classified under the common definition.

This requires examination of:

- qualifying remuneration;
- expressly included components;
- statutory exclusions;

- exclusions relevant to the first proviso;
- the 50% threshold; and
- other relevant provisions.

Stage Two: Apply the Relevant Operative Provision

Once wages are determined, the particular statutory provision must be examined.

The result may differ depending upon whether the issue concerns:

- minimum wage compliance;
- social security contribution;
- a statutory benefit;
- retrenchment compensation;
- gratuity; or
- another purpose under the relevant Code.

The common definition therefore promotes consistency at the first stage without eliminating the need for purpose-specific analysis at the second stage.

The research material supplied for this paper repeatedly emphasises this distinction, and it represents one of the strongest analytical foundations for understanding the new framework.

Implications for Provident Fund, Esi, Gratuity And Social Security

The harmonised definition is likely to have important implications for social security administration. Recent official FAQs further emphasise the need to apply the relevant contribution or benefit provision rather than a single formula indiscriminately (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2026).

Historically, questions relating to provident fund contributions produced considerable litigation concerning the distinction between basic wages and allowances.

The common definition seeks to provide a broader and more integrated statutory basis.

However, it would be legally unsafe to assume that every statutory contribution or benefit is automatically calculated in precisely the same way.

The relevant scheme, substantive provision, contribution formula, ceiling and statutory condition must still be examined.

For example, a social security scheme may contain:

- its own contribution rate;
- an eligibility condition;
- a wage ceiling;
- a statutory maximum;

- a benefit formula; or
- transitional provisions.

Therefore, the correct sequence remains:

Determine wages under the definition → Identify the applicable scheme or statutory provision → apply the specific contribution or benefit rule.

The official FAQs issued after implementation also demonstrate the importance of examining the precise statutory context. The Ministry has issued clarifications on matters including gratuity, overtime and the composition of remuneration for the 50% exercise, confirming that the subject cannot be reduced to a single formula applicable indiscriminately to all situations.

Implications for Compensation Structuring

The reform may significantly change the philosophy of salary design.

Earlier Approach

In the earlier system, different statutory definitions could encourage different wage bases for different purposes.

A compensation professional might ask:

How should this allowance be structured for provident fund purposes?

A separate question could arise under another statute.

Emerging Approach

Under the Labour Codes, the more appropriate starting question is:

What is the legally determined wage base after the entire remuneration structure has been classified under the common definition?

The second question is then:

What consequence follows under the particular statutory provision?

This represents a movement from **Act-specific salary structuring** to **integrated compensation governance**.

Component-Wise Legal Mapping

Employers should conduct a structured review of every remuneration component.

The following matrix may be useful:

Question	Legal Examination Required
What is the component?	Identify its real nature and purpose
Is it remuneration?	Examine whether it is payable in respect of employment
Is it expressly included?	Check basic pay, DA and retaining allowance
Is it excluded?	Identify the precise statutory exclusion

Is it covered by the 50% proviso?	Classify it according to the relevant clause
Is it terminal in nature?	Apply separate treatment where required
Is it fixed or variable?	Examine the statutory and factual basis
What is the consequence?	Apply the relevant substantive provision

This is preferable to mechanically increasing basic pay to 50% without examining the remaining components.

The source material prepared on the subject similarly recommends component-wise legal mapping rather than artificial restructuring around a presumed “50% Basic Pay” requirement.

Payroll, HRIS and Administrative Challenges

Implementing the common definition may require significant administrative preparation. Payroll systems must be capable of identifying the legal treatment of individual salary components.

A simple classification of:

- “wage”; and
- “non-wage”

may be inadequate.

Organisations may instead require at least three categories:

1. Components directly forming part of wages;
2. Components excluded but relevant to the 50% add-back calculation; and
3. Components separately excluded or requiring different statutory treatment.

This has implications for:

- payroll software;
- HRIS configuration;
- employment contracts;
- appointment letters;
- salary revision letters;
- internal compensation policies;
- financial provisioning; and
- statutory compliance reporting.

Implementation should therefore involve coordination between HR, Finance, Payroll, Legal, Compliance and technology teams.

Employee Communication and Take-Home Salary

Salary restructuring may have an immediate psychological impact on employees even where the total CTC remains unchanged.

Employees generally focus on:

- monthly gross salary;
- deductions; and
- take-home pay.

They may not initially focus on the difference between statutory wages and the overall cost of employment.

If the wage base increases and this affects applicable statutory deductions, employees may perceive the change as a salary reduction.

Therefore, communication is essential. Employers should clearly explain:

1. the reason for the review;
2. the relevant legal change;
3. the difference between CTC, gross salary and statutory wages;
4. the components affected;
5. whether the overall CTC is changing;
6. the likely impact on deductions; and
7. the possible long-term implications for statutory benefits.

A simple comparative statement can be useful:

Particulars	Before Restructuring	After Restructuring
Total remuneration	X	X
Statutory wage components	X	Y
Applicable deductions	X	Y
Take-home salary	X	Y
Relevant long-term statutory implications	X	Y

The communication should be factual and balanced. Employers should not suggest that every employee will necessarily receive proportionately greater benefits under every scheme because actual outcomes depend upon the relevant law, scheme and applicable ceilings.

The materials supplied for this research similarly stress that employees should understand the basis and implications of restructuring before the revised salary appears in the payslip.

Critical Issues Requiring Continuing Clarification

The common definition is a major reform, but practical questions are likely to continue.

Meaning and Scope of Total Remuneration

The precise treatment of components for the purpose of calculating the statutory threshold must follow the statutory language and official clarifications.

The Ministry's 2026 FAQs have addressed certain questions, but future factual situations may require further clarification. (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2025, 2026) [Labour Government of India](#)

Variable and Performance-Linked Payments

Incentives and other variable components may raise questions concerning:

- the basis of payment;
- the frequency of payment;
- whether the payment is universally payable;
- its relationship with performance or output; and
- the precise statutory exclusion applicable.

These questions should not be answered simply by applying a generic rule to every variable component.

Existing Employment Contracts

A statutory change in wage determination does not automatically mean that an employer can unilaterally alter every contractual salary component.

Employment contracts, service rules, collective settlements and other applicable obligations must be separately considered.

Transitional Questions

Questions may also arise regarding:

- the date from which revised calculations apply;
- accrued rights;
- accounting treatment;
- gratuity calculations; and
- other transitional issues.

The Ministry's FAQs expressly address the prospective application of gratuity from the date of enforcement referred to in the clarification. (Ministry of Labour & Employment, 2025, 2026) [Labour Government of India](#)

Future Judicial Interpretation

The Supreme Court's earlier jurisprudence developed over several decades under the earlier statutory regime. The new Codes will eventually develop their own jurisprudence. Future cases may clarify issues relating to:

- the meaning of total remuneration;

- the treatment of particular allowances;
- the interaction between the common definition and scheme-specific provisions;
- the scope of the 50% proviso; and
- the extent to which earlier judicial principles remain applicable.

Contribution of the Study

This study separates three questions often merged in professional discussions of the Labour Codes: what constitutes statutory wages, how the 50% add-back mechanism operates, and what legal consequence follows after wages have been determined. By bringing the four definitions, the pre-Code judicial background, the 50% proviso, the ₹18,000 worker-status threshold, and the distinction between wages, minimum wages and scheme-specific ceilings into one analytical framework, the paper provides a more cautious basis for compensation and compliance decisions. The study therefore treats the Labour Codes not simply as a payroll restructuring exercise, but as a change in the legal architecture of compensation governance.

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

The principal findings are as follows: The findings are based on the statutory texts, official administrative guidance, and the judicial and scholarly literature identified in the methodology.

First, the Four Labour Codes Establish a Substantially Common Definition of Wages

The common framework is a deliberate legislative attempt to reduce definitional fragmentation.

Second, Basic Pay Is Not the Same as Statutory Wages

Basic pay is expressly included in wages, but the statutory wage figure must be determined by examining the complete definition.

Third, the 50% Provision Is Not a Mandatory “Basic Pay Equals 50% of CTC” Rule

The statutory mechanism concerns the aggregate treatment of specified exclusions. Where the relevant exclusions exceed the prescribed threshold, the excess is added back into wages.

Fourth, the ₹18,000 Threshold Does Not Exempt Higher-Paid Employees from the Definition of Wages

The ₹18,000 figure is relevant to the definition of certain supervisory employees as “workers” under the Industrial Relations Code. It should not be confused with the common definition of wages. (Government of India, 2020a) [India Code](#)

Fifth, Wage Ceilings Must Be Distinguished from Wage Definitions

A ceiling applicable to a particular social security scheme cannot automatically be treated as a limit on the application of the general definition of wages.

Sixth, Earlier Judicial Decisions Remain Important but Must Be Used Carefully

Cases such as *Bridge & Roof* and *Vivekananda Vidyamandir* provide important principles concerning statutory exclusions and the substance of remuneration. However, the new statutory text must govern interpretation under the Labour Codes.

Seventh, Uniform Definition Does Not Mean Uniform Calculation of Every Benefit

The common definition determines the starting wage figure. The ultimate consequence depends upon the particular substantive provision or scheme.

Eighth, Compensation Governance Will Need to Become More Integrated

The issue can no longer be treated solely as a payroll or HR matter. It requires coordination among HR, Finance, Payroll, Legal, Compliance and technology functions.

CONCLUSION

Harmonising the definition of wages under India's four Labour Codes is one of the most important structural developments in the country's labour law reform.

Its importance lies not merely in changing the wording of a definition. It represents an attempt to move away from multiple statutory wage concepts towards a common legal foundation.

The reform addresses a genuine historical problem. Under the earlier regime, different laws required employers and employees to work with different definitions and different wage bases. This created complexity and contributed to continuing disputes over the treatment of allowances and other components of remuneration.

The new framework seeks to simplify the starting point.

At the same time, simplification should not be confused with oversimplification.

The statutory definition contains a broad concept of remuneration, express inclusions, specific exclusions and an important add-back mechanism. The 50% provision is particularly significant. Properly understood, it is not a statutory direction that basic pay must always be fixed at 50% of CTC. It is a mechanism that limits the extent to which relevant excluded components can reduce the statutory wage base.

The correct legal exercise is therefore not to start with the question:

Is Basic Pay 50% of CTC?

The more appropriate questions are:

What are all the components of remuneration?

How is each component classified under the statutory definition?

Which exclusions are relevant to the 50% proviso?

Does the aggregate of those exclusions exceed the statutory threshold?

If so, what amount must be added back into wages?

Only after these questions have been answered should the employer proceed to determine the consequence under the particular substantive provision.

The distinction between wages, minimum wages, wage ceilings and the ₹18,000 threshold under the Industrial Relations Code is equally important. These are separate legal concepts and should not be merged into a single formula.

The most defensible interpretation of the Labour Codes is therefore based on a two-stage approach:

Stage One: Determine wages under the common statutory definition.

Stage Two: Apply the particular provision, scheme, contribution formula, benefit rule or compensation provision for which that wage figure is required.

This approach preserves both the harmonising purpose of the Labour Codes and the purpose-specific character of labour and social security legislation.

The reform's long-term effect may be a gradual shift toward simpler, more transparent compensation structures. Organisations may find it increasingly difficult to rely upon excessive fragmentation of ordinary remuneration into multiple allowances without examining the statutory consequences.

The real transformation, therefore, may not be the emergence of a compulsory “50% Basic Pay” formula. It may be the emergence of a new discipline in compensation design: every component of remuneration will increasingly need a clear legal character, a genuine purpose and a defensible statutory treatment.

In that sense, the most significant contribution of the common definition of wages is the movement from allowance-driven salary engineering towards legally coherent compensation structuring.

REFERENCES

1. Bridge & Roof Co. (India) Ltd. v. Union of India, AIR 1963 SC 1474 (India).
2. Chopra, R., & Sharma, S. (2026, July 16). Understanding the 50% wage rule under the Code on Wages, 2019: A cap on exclusions, not a ceiling on basic pay. Chambers and Partners.
3. Code on Social Security, 2020, No. 36 of 2020 (India).
4. Code on Wages, 2019, No. 29 of 2019 (India).
5. Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, No. 19 of 1952 (India).
6. Government of India. (2020a). Industrial Relations Code, 2020, No. 35 of 2020. Ministry of Law and Justice.
7. Government of India. (2020b). Code on Social Security, 2020, No. 36 of 2020. Ministry of Law and Justice.
8. Government of India. (2020c). Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020, No. 37 of 2020. Ministry of Law and Justice.
9. Government of India. (2021). Economic Survey 2020–21 (Vol. 2). Ministry of Finance.
10. Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment. (2025). FAQs on the Labour Codes. <https://labour.gov.in/>
11. Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment. (2026, March 16). Additional FAQs on Labour Codes. <https://labour.gov.in/>
12. Mani, M., Mathew, B., Pellissery, S., & Bharadkar, K. (2021, November 1). The making of a new labour law regime in India. National Law School of India University. <https://www.nls.ac.in/publications/the-making-of-a-new-labour-law-regime-in-india/>
13. Manipal Academy of Higher Education v. Provident Fund Commissioner, (2008) 5 SCC 428 (India).
14. Mehrotra, S., & Sarkar, K. (2025). Impact of India's new labour codes on workers (IZA Policy Paper No. 218). Institute of Labor Economics. <https://www.iza.org/publications/pp/218/impact-of-indias-new-labour-codes-on-workers>
15. Muir Mills Co. Ltd. v. Its Workmen, AIR 1960 SC 985 (India).
16. Occupational Safety, Health and Working Conditions Code, 2020, No. 37 of 2020 (India).
17. Payment of Gratuity Act, 1972, No. 39 of 1972 (India).
18. Ramaswamy, R., & Binnuri, A. (2023). An analysis of the impact of India's Labour Codes on its organised and unorganised sectors. Cogent Social Sciences, 9(1), 2238458. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2238458>

19. Regional Provident Fund Commissioner (II), West Bengal v. Vivekananda Vidyamandir, (2019) 4 SCC 556 (India).
20. Som, R. (2022). Labour Codes. In Personnel management in India and worldwide: The past, present, and future (pp. 101–110). Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780192883773.003.0012>