

Court No. - 6

Case :- WRIT - A No. - 12381 of 2024

Petitioner :- Rupesh Kumar Yadav

Respondent :- State Of U.P. Thru. Addl. Chief Secy./Prin. Secy. Deptt. Of Hort. And Food Pro. Lko. And 2 Others

Counsel for Petitioner :- Vinod Kumar Shukla

Counsel for Respondent :- C.S.C.

Hon'ble Alok Mathur,J.

1. Heard learned counsel for petitioner and learned State Counsel appearing on behalf of opposite parties.

2. Petition has been filed seeking a direction to the opposite parties for payment of minimum of pay scale as revised from time to time and for extension of benefit of judgment rendered by this court on 9th February, 2022 in the case of **Jai Prakash Verma and others versus State of U.P. and others.**

3. It is submitted that opposite parties themselves have granted benefit of minimum of the pay scale to a number of similarly situated employees as the petitioners who are daily wage employees of the department. It is therefore submitted that petitioners are also entitled to be treated similarly particularly in view of aforesaid judgment of this court. For the said grievance, the petitioners have already submitted a representation before the concerned authority and seek liberty to file a fresh representation.

4. Considering innocuous prayer being made by learned counsel for the petitioners and without entering into the merits of the case petitioners are granted liberty to file a fresh representation before opposite party No. 2 i.e. Director, Horticulture & Food Processing, Lucknow Division, Lucknow along with judgment

a copy of judgment rendered by this court in the case of **Jai Prakash Verma (supra)**. In case such a representation is preferred by petitioners, the same shall be decided within a period of six weeks from the date a certified copy of this order along with representation is produced before the authority concerned, who shall consider and decide the same on merits and grant benefits of the judgment and order dated 9th February, 2023 passed in Writ A No. 8812 of 2022, Jai Prakash Verma and others versus State of U.P. and others in case petitioners are entitled for parity with the same.

5. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands **disposed of**.

[Alok Mathur,J.]

Order Date :- 19.12.2024

KR