INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR LEGAL RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS

Open Access, Refereed Journal Multi Disciplinary Peer Reviewed

www.ijlra.com

ISSN: 2582-6433

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, or distributed in any form or by any means, whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission of the Managing Editor of the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA).*

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles published in this journal are solely those of the respective authors. They do not necessarily reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, or the Publisher of IJLRA.

Although every reasonable effort has been made to ensure the accuracy, authenticity, and proper citation of the content published in this journal, neither the Editorial Board nor IJLRA shall be held liable or responsible, in any manner whatsoever, for any loss, damage, or consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the information contained in this publication.

The content published herein is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice or professional opinion.

Copyright © International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis. All rights reserved.

ABOUT US

The *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis (IJLRA)* (ISSN: 2582-6433) is a peer-reviewed, academic, online journal published on a monthly basis. The journal aims to provide a comprehensive and interactive platform for the publication of original and high-quality legal research.

IJLRA publishes Short Articles, Long Articles, Research Papers, Case Comments, Book Reviews, Essays, and interdisciplinary studies in the field of law and allied disciplines. The journal seeks to promote critical analysis and informed discourse on contemporary legal, social, and policy issues.

The primary objective of IJLRA is to enhance academic engagement and scholarly dialogue among law students, researchers, academicians, legal professionals, and members of the Bar and Bench. The journal endeavours to establish itself as a credible and widely cited academic publication through the publication of original, well-researched, and analytically sound contributions.

IJLRA welcomes submissions from all branches of law, provided the work is original, unpublished, and submitted in accordance with the prescribed submission guidelines. All manuscripts are subject to a rigorous peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, the *International Journal for Legal Research & Analysis* aspires to contribute meaningfully to legal scholarship and the development of law as an instrument of justice and social progress.

ISSN: 2582-6433

PUBLICATION ETHICS, COPYRIGHT & AUTHOR RESPONSIBILITY STATEMENT

The *International Journal for Legal Research and Analysis (IJLRA)* is committed to upholding the highest standards of publication ethics and academic integrity. All manuscripts submitted to the journal must be original, unpublished, and free from plagiarism, data fabrication, falsification, or any form of unethical research or publication practice. Authors are solely responsible for the accuracy, originality, legality, and ethical compliance of their work and must ensure that all sources are properly cited and that necessary permissions for any third-party copyrighted material have been duly obtained prior to submission. Copyright in all published articles vests with IJLRA, unless otherwise expressly stated, and authors grant the journal the irrevocable right to publish, reproduce, distribute, and archive their work in print and electronic formats. The views and opinions expressed in the articles are those of the authors alone and do not reflect the views of the Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, or Publisher. IJLRA shall not be liable for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising from the use, reliance upon, or interpretation of the content published. By submitting a manuscript, the author(s) agree to fully indemnify and hold harmless the journal, its Editor-in-Chief, Editors, Editorial Board, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, and Management against any claims, liabilities, or legal proceedings arising out of plagiarism, copyright infringement, defamation, breach of confidentiality, or violation of third-party rights. The journal reserves the absolute right to reject, withdraw, retract, or remove any manuscript or published article in case of ethical or legal violations, without incurring any liability.

ISSN: 2582-6433

AMBIGUITY IN 1% PER MONTH: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF THE 2024 EPF PENAL DAMAGES AMENDMENT

AUTHORED BY - RISHIKA SINGH
KLE Law College, Bengaluru

CO-AUTHOR - DR. JYOTI LAMBA
Gyan Ganga College of Excellence Jabalpur

ABSTRACT

The Ministry of Labour and Employment, through a Gazette Notification dated June 14, 2024, amended Para 32A of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952, replacing the erstwhile graduated penalty structure with a uniform rate of 1% per month on delayed contributions under the EPF Act 1952. While the amendment ostensibly aims at simplification and ease of doing business, it introduces a critical and unresolved interpretative ambiguity: whether '1%' per month is to be computed on the basis of each completed calendar month or on a proportionate (pro rata) daily basis for partial months. This paper subjects the question to rigorous legal analysis through the prism of statutory interpretation, constitutional proportionality doctrine, and comparative analysis . The paper demonstrates that the calendar month interpretation produces outcomes that are arbitrary, disproportionate, and inconsistent with the stated legislation intent and advances the pro-rata interpretation as the legally and constitutionally sound approach.

Keywords*: EPF Act 1952, Penal damages, section 14B, Para 32A, Statutory interpretation, proportionality, pro rata computation, labour law, EPFO, Ease of doing business*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952, is one of the foundational pillars of India's social security framework; it mandates compulsory contributions from both employers and employees towards provident fund, pension, and insurance benefits. The enforcement mechanism of the act is anchored in significant part in Section 14B, which empowers the Central Provident Fund Commissioner or an officer

ISSN: 2582-6433

authorized by him to levy penal damages upon employers who default in payment of any amount due under the statute. These damages are, by statutory design, distinct from the interest already payable under Section 7Q at 12% per annum and constitute an independent punitive levy intended to deter delinquency.

For over four decades, the penal damage regime operated through a graduated slab structure prescribed under Para. 32A of the Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952. The rate escalated with the duration of the default, ranging from 5% per annum for delays of up to two months to 25% per annum for delays exceeding six months. While this structure was criticized for being overly punitive in cases of prolonged default, it had the advantage of computational determinacy expressed as an annual rate, which allowed for simple pro rata calculation for any period of delay, regardless of whether it corresponded to an integer number of months.

By way of an Official Gazette Notification dated June 14, 2024, the Ministry of Labour and Employment superseded this graduated structure and introduced a uniform penal damages rate of '1%' per month across all three social security schemes: the EPF Scheme, the Employees Pension Scheme, 1995, and the Employees Deposit Linked Insurance Scheme, 1976. The change was presented as a simplification measure aligned with the government of India's ease of doing business agenda.

However, the amendment has generated an interpretive vacuum of considerable practical significance. The phrase '1%' per month admits of two mutually exclusive readings: (i) a calendar month interpretation under which the '1%' levy attaches for each completed or commenced calendar month of delay, treating any fraction of a month as a full month, and (ii) a pro-rata interpretation under which the 1% monthly rate is converted into a daily rate and applied proportionately to the actual number of days of delay. Neither the Gazette Notification nor the EPF Act nor any EPFO circular issued date resolves this ambiguity. This paper undertakes a systematic legal analysis of this question and its consequences.

II. LEGISLATIVE BACKGROUND: SECTION 14B, PARA 32A AND THE 2024 AMENDMENT

A. The statutory Framework

Section 14B of the EPF Act confers upon the central provident fund commissioner and authorized officers the power to recover damages from employers who default in payment of

any contribution or any charges payable under any scheme or the insurance scheme. The section is explicitly penal in nature and operates independently of the interest liability under Section 7Q. Critically, Section 14B does not prescribe the rate of damages; rather, it delegates rate-setting to the applicable scheme, with the exception of the outer limit that total damages do not exceed the amount of arrears in question.[1]

Para 32A The EPF Scheme historically discharged this rate-setting function through a four-tier graduated structure keyed to the duration of the default. The corresponding provisions were Para. 5 of the Employees Pension Scheme and Para. 8A of the Employees Deposit-Linked Insurance Scheme. All three provisions operated in tandem to create a uniform penalty structure across the three arms of the EPF system.[2]

B. The Pre-Amendment Graduated Regime

Prior to June 14, 2024, the damage rates were expressed in annual percentage terms and graduated as follows: 5% per annum for delays not exceeding two months, 10% per annum for delays between two and four months, 15% per annum for delays between four and six months, and 25% per annum for delays exceeding six months. These annual rates inherently permitted proportionate computation for any sub-monthly period by simple division over the number of days in a year or month through the EPFO's administrative Practice was not always consistent in this regard.[3]

C. The Gazette Notification 2024: Text, Scope and Stated rationale

The Gazette Notification dated June 14, 2024, amended Para 32A of the EPF Scheme. Para 5 of EPS and Para 8A of the EDLI Scheme by substituting the graduated rate structure with a single undifferentiated rate of 1% per month. The notification simultaneously amended Table D of the EPS (governing returns of contributions on exit from employment) and Table B of the EPS (governing the computation of past services pension benefits), though these latter amendments fall outside the primary scope of this paper.

The Ministry of Labour and Employment's accompanying communications characterized the amendment as a measure to promote ease of doing business by simplifying the computation of penal damages. This stated rationale is significant for purposes of purposive statutory interpretation. The amendment does not , however, define the term 'month' for the purpose of

[1] Employees' Provident Fund and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 14B (India)
[2] Employees Provident Fund Scheme, 1952 (India) (as amended by gazette notification dated June 14, 2024)
[3] Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, 1952, 32A (as it stood prior to June 14, 2024) (India)

computing damages, nor does it specify whether fractional months are to be rounded up, rounded down, or computed pro rata. This silence is the source of the ambiguity that this paper examines.

III.ANALYSING THE INTERPRETIVE AMBIGUITY

A. The two competing interpretations

The phrase '1%' per month in the amended Para 32A generates two distinct and legally defensible computational frameworks:

The Calendar Month Interpretation

Under this construction. 'Month' denotes a discrete calendar unit. The 1% charge is levied once for each calendar month or part thereof during which the arrears remain outstanding. Any period of delay that commences within or crosses into a new calendar month attracts the full 1% charge for that month. The implication is binary: a delay of 31 days spanning two calendar months attracts 2% in aggregate, precisely the same as a delay of 59 days spanning those same two months.

The pro rata Interpretation

According to this construction, "per month" refers to a rate that is comparable to the annual rate, accrues continuously and can be converted into a daily rate of roughly 1/30 or 1/31 (depending on the month). The total damages are computed by multiplying the daily rate by the actual number of days of delay, including partial months. This approach ensures that the penalty is precisely calibrated to the duration of the default.

B. The cliff edge problem

The calendar month interpretation creates what welfare economists and regulatory scholars term a 'notch' or 'cliff-edge' effect: a discontinuous jump in liability triggered by crossing a temporal threshold. An employer whose arrear is one day late into a second calendar month faces double the penalty of an employer who cleared the arrear on the last day of the first month, even though the additional cost of the delay to the social security system is only one day's worth of foregone contribution. This discontinuity is structurally arbitrary and bears no rational relationship to the legislative objective of deterring default.

C. Absence of statutory definition and EPFO Guidance

Neither the EPF Act nor the amended Para. 32A defines the term 'month' for the purpose of damage computation. The General Clauses Act, 1897, Section 3(35), defines 'month' as a

month reckoned according to the British calendar but provides no guidance on the treatment of partial months in the computation of percentage-based penal charges. No EPFO circular, instruction or administrative guidance has been issued as of the date of this paper to resolve the ambiguity[4]

IV. STATUTORY INTERPRETATION: RESOLVING THE AMBIGUITY

A. The Rule Against Absurdity

A foundational canon of statutory construction, consistently applied by the Supreme Court of India, holds that a statute should not be construed in a manner that produces an outcome that is manifestly unreasonable, unjust, or absurd. In CIT v. Hindustan Bulk Carriers.[5] The court observed that where two constructions of a provision are open, the court should prefer that which avoids a repugnant or irrational result.

The calendar month interpretation yields precisely such an irrational result: it treats a delay of 31 days identically to a delay of 59 days and a delay of 61 days identically to a delay of 89 days, so far as the quantum of damages is concerned. The effective damage rate per day is thus highly variable and inversely related to the position of the default within the calendar month—a result that has no legal rationale. The pro-rata interpretation avoids this absurdity by ensuring that the penalty per day of delay is constant regardless of when within the month the delay occurs

B. Strict Construction of penal Provisions

It is a well-established principle of statutory interpretation in India, as in common law jurisdictions generally, that ambiguous penal provisions must be strictly construed, and where two constructions are reasonably available, the one less burdensome to the subject must be preferred. The Supreme Court affirmed this principle unambiguously in Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay,[6] holding that penal statutes must be construed strictly and that the benefit of ambiguity must accrue to the person on whom the liability is sought to be imposed. This canon applies with full force to section 14B and paragraph 32A, which are explicitly punitive provisions.

Applying strict construction, the pro-rata interpretation, being less burdensome on employers,

[4] Ministry of Labour and Employment, Gazette Notification No. G.S.R. 365(E) (June 14, 2024)
[5] CIT v. Hindustan Bulk Carriers (2003) 3 SCC 57
[6] Tolaram Relumal v. State of Bombay AIR 1954 SC 496

ISSN: 2582-6433

must be preferred in the absence of clear legislative direction to the contrary. The calendar month interpretation, which can impose almost double the penalty for a marginal difference in the duration of the default, cannot be sustained as the stricter construction without express statutory warrant.

C. Purposive construction and the legislative intent of simplification

The purposive approach to statutory interpretation, now firmly embedded in Indian jurisprudence[7], requires the court to ascertain the purpose or object of a legislative provision and to prefer the construction that best advances that purpose. The stated purpose of the 2024 amendment is unambiguous: the ministry described it as a measure to promote ease of doing business by simplifying the computation of penal damages.

A calendar month interpretation does not simplify; it replaces the complexity of graduated slabs with the complexity of arbitrary cliff edges at monthly boundaries. Employers and their compliance officers must now track not merely the duration of the default but its precise position within the calendar to determine whether a single additional day of delay will double their liability. This is not simplification; it is the substitution of one form of complexity for another, more capricious form. The pro-rata interpretation, by contrast, genuinely simplifies; it reduces the computation to a single arithmetic operation (arrear x 1% x days/30) that is transparent, predictable, and consistent with the ministry's stated objective.

D. The Rule of Consistent interpretation within the statutory Scheme

Where a term appears in multiple provisions of a statute or a suite of related statutes, it ought to be given a consistent meaning across those provisions. The EPF Act and the three schemes form an integrated social security code. The interest liability under Section 7Q is computed at 12% per annum, a rate that, by its annual denomination, clearly contemplates proportionate daily computation for partial periods. The penal damages provision, now expressed as a monthly rate, ought to be interpreted in a manner consistent with this broader framework for accrual-based liability computation. The pro-rata approach achieves this consistency; the calendar month approach does not.

[7] See,e.g. Seaford Court Estates Ltd. v. Asher (1949) 2 KB 481 (Eng. CA) (Lord Denning) (purposive approach); adopted in Indian jurisprudence in Workmen v. American Express International Banking Corp. (1985) 4 SCC 71

V. CONSTITUTIONAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW DIMENSIONS

A. The doctrine of proportionality

The doctrine of proportionality, drawn from German administrative law and now firmly assimilated into Indian constitutional jurisprudence through a series of Supreme Court decisions[8], requires that administrative and legislative action imposing burdens on persons bear a rational and proportionate relationship to the legitimate aim being pursued. In the context of penal provisions, this principle demands that the quantum of the penalty be commensurate with the severity of the wrong.

The calendar month interpretation violates the proportionality requirement in a stark and demonstrable manner. An employer who delays payment by 31 days and one who delays by 59 days are treated identically, even though the latter has withheld contributions for nearly twice as long, causing correspondingly greater harm to the beneficiaries of the EPF system. The penalty bears no rational relationship to the degree of default. The pro-rata interpretation, by contrast, is inherently proportionate; the penalty scales linearly with the duration of the default, ensuring that the burden imposed is precisely commensurate with the wrong committed.

B. Article 14 and the Principle against Arbitrariness

Article 14 of the Constitution of India guarantees equality before the law and equal protection of the laws. The Supreme Court, in a long line of decisions beginning with E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu[9] and consolidated in Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India[10], has held that Article 14 strikes at arbitrariness in state action. A penal regime that treats objectively different durations of default—say, 31 days and 59 days—as identical for the purpose of imposing damages is arbitrary and thus potentially susceptible to challenge under Article 14. Employers subject to the harsher end of the cliff-edge effect would have a colorable argument that the calendar month interpretation constitutes an arbitrary classification without intelligible differentia.

C. Legitimate Expectations and Regulatory Certainty

Employers who have historically operated under the pre-2024 annual rate structure, which inherently facilitated proportionate computation, have a legitimate expectation of a rational,

[8] Om Kumar v. Union of India (2001) 2 SCC 386; Cellular Operators Assn. of India v. TRAL (2016) 7 SCC 703.
[9] E.P. Royappa v. State of Tamil Nadu (1974) 4 SCC 3 (India)
[10] Maneka Gandhi v. Union of India (1978) 1 SCC 248 (India)

unambiguous, and predictable penalty regime. The introduction of an ambiguous 'per month' rate, without accompanying clarification, frustrates this expectation and deprives employers of the regulatory certainty necessary for compliance planning. The doctrine of legitimate expectation, recognized in Indian administrative law[11], provides a further normative basis for preferring the pro-rata interpretation as the one more consistent with the reasonable expectations of regulated persons.

VI.COMPARATIVE LEGAL ANALYSIS

A. Income Tax Act, 1961: Sections 234A, 234B, and 234C

The Income Tax Act, 1961, provides the closest domestic comparator for penal interest and damages in a fiscal context. Sections 234A, 234B, and 234C impose interest at specified monthly rates for defaults in filing returns and paying advance tax. Crucially, each of these provisions contains an express deeming clause that any fraction of a month shall be treated as a full month for the purpose of computing interest.[12] This deeming fiction is a deliberate legislative choice, explicitly enacted to achieve the calendar month result that proponents of interpretation would attribute to the EPF provision by implication.

The significance of this comparison is twofold. First, the drafters of Indian fiscal legislation are demonstrably aware of the need to express the calendar month rounding rule explicitly when it is intended. Second, the absence of any analogous deeming clause in the amended Para 32A is a powerful indicator that the legislature did not intend the calendar month approach in the EPF context. Applying the maxim "expressio unius est exclusio alterius," the express mention of a thing excludes others—the presence of such a clause in the Income Act and its absence from the EPF Scheme argues strongly for the pro-rata interpretation in the latter.

B. Goods and Service Tax Act, 2017: Section 50

Section 50 of the Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017, prescribes interest on delayed payment of tax at 18% per annum. The annual denomination inherently enables daily pro rata computation, and the GST council's administrative guidance consistently treats interest as accruing continuously and proportionately, not as discrete periodic charges triggered by calendar boundaries. This approach aligns with the pro-rata interpretation advanced in this paper.

[11] Union of India v. Hindustan development Corporation (1993) 3 SCC 499 (India)
[12] Maneka Gandhi v.Union of India (1978) 1 SCC 248 (India)

ISSN: 2582-6433

VII. ECONOMIC AND COMPLIANCE IMPLICATIONS

A. Distortion of Compliance Incentive

The cliff-edge effect generated by the calendar month interpretation has well-documented adverse consequences for compliance incentives. Economic literature on notch-based penalty structures demonstrates that they create 'bunching' behavior at the threshold and 'holes' just beyond it: rational actors who anticipate crossing the threshold have a heightened incentive to comply just before it, while those who have already crossed it have no additional incentive to comply quickly until the next threshold approaches.[13]

Applied to the EPF context, an employer who has already incurred 31 days of delay and thus, under the calendar month interpretation, already accrued 2% faces no additional penalty for a further 28 days of delay. The marginal cost of continued default is zero until day 61, when a new monthly charge attaches. This creates a perverse 'free period' of non-compliance within each monthly interval precisely contrary to the deterrence objective of Section 14B.

B. Disproportionate Impact on MSME's

The disproportionate financial burden of the calendar month interpretation would fall most acutely on micro, small, and medium enterprises "MSMEs," which constitute the overwhelming majority of EPF-registered establishments in India. MSMEs characteristically operate with constrained working capital and irregular cash flows, making them more susceptible to payment delays of 30 to 50 days. For such enterprises, the cliff-edge penalty can represent a near doubling of the effective damage rate for a marginal delay of a few days beyond a monthly boundary.

This outcome is inconsistent with the Government of India. MSMEs, as reflected in the MSME Development Act, 2006, and various policy pronouncements by the Ministry of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprises. A pro-rata approach would ensure that the penalty burden on MSMEs is calibrated proportionately to their actual duration of default.

C. Administrative Inconsistency and Litigation Risk.

In the absence of a uniform computational methodology prescribed by the EPFO, different regional offices and field officers are likely to adopt different interpretations of 1% per month, creating inconsistent assessment outcomes for similarly situated employers. This administrative inconsistency generates a compliance arbitrage problem and undermines the

[13] Central Goods and Services Tax Act, 2017 (India); GST Council, Circular 26/26/2017-GST (Jan. 1, 2018)

rule of law in a domain where certainty is essential. Moreover, employers subjected to the calendar month interpretation are likely to challenge demand notices before the EPF Appellate Tribunal and ultimately before the High Court under Article 226, giving rise to a volume of litigation that the simplification amendment was ostensibly intended to prevent.

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Immediate EPFO Circular

The most expedient remedy is the issuance of a clarificatory circular by the EPFO pursuant to its administrative powers under the EPF Act expressly adopting the pro-rata computation methodology. Such a circular should

1. Define the daily rate as 1% divided by the actual number of days in the relevant month (or a standardized 30-day month, consistently applied).
2. Prescribe the formula : Penal Damages = (Amount in Arrears x 1% x Actual Days of Delay) ÷ 30
3. Specify the date from which the period of delay is reckoned (typically the due date under the relevant scheme) and the date of actual payment as the end date.
4. Provide worked numerical examples for common delay scenarios, including delays straddling month ends.
5. Direct all regional offices and enforcement officers to apply the pro-rata method uniformly with effect from June 14, 2024.

B. Legislative Amendment to Para 32A

A circular, while providing immediate relief, does not have the force of law and may be challenged or overridden. The durable solution is a formal amendment to Para. 32A of the EPF Scheme, inserting an explanatory sub-paragraph that defines the computation methodology for partial months. Modeled on the income tax framework but opting for pro rata rather than rounding up, the sub-paragraph should read in substance:

"For the purposes of computing the rate of damages under this paragraph where the period of default includes a fraction of a month, such fraction shall be computed on a pro-rata basis by dividing the monthly rate of 1% by the number of days in that month and multiplying by the actual number of days of delay falling within that month."

C. Technology-Driven Automated Computation

The EPFO's Unified Portal and ECR filing system should be updated to compute penal

ISSN: 2582-6433

damages automatically on a day count basis. An algorithm embedded in the portal would eliminate the possibility of inconsistent manual computation by different officers, ensure uniformity of application, and provide employers with real-time transparency into their liability. The EPFO has previously demonstrated the technical capacity to implement automated interest computation under Section 7Q, and extending this functionality to Section 14B damages is a logical and feasible step.

IX. CONCLUSION

The 2024 amendment to the penal damages regime under the EPF Act represents a policy reform conceived in the spirit of simplification but delivered with an unintended complexity. By replacing a graduated annual-rate structure with a uniform '1% per month' rate without defining the computational methodology for partial months, the ministry has created an interpretative ambiguity that has the potential to impose arbitrary, disproportionate, and legally untenable burdens upon employers, particularly those in the MSME sectors.

The paper has demonstrated through a multi-pronged legal analysis that the pro-rata interpretation of '1% per month' is compelled by the established canons of statutory interpretation (the rule against absurdity, strict construction of penal provisions, and purposive interpretation) supported by constitutional doctrine (proportionality under Articles 14 and 21) confirmed by comparative legislative practice (the express deeming clauses of the Income Tax Act and the continuous accrual model of the GST Act).

The calendar month interpretation, by contrast, lacks positive legislative support, generates results that are arbitrary and disproportionate, and is antithetical to the very objective of ease and simplicity that the amendment was designed to serve. It cannot be sustained as a matter of sound statutory construction or constitutional law.

The onus now lies with the EPFO and the Ministry to address this regulatory lacuna with appropriate urgency. An EPFO circular adopting the pro-rata methodology would provide immediate administrative relief. A formal amendment to Para 32A expressly codifying the pro-rata formula would provide the durable, litigation-proof solution that employers, practitioners, and the social security system require. Until such clarification is forthcoming, the legal uncertainty generated by the 2024 amendment remains a substantive risk to the ease of doing business that it sought to advance.