



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No.1808 of 2026

14th July, 2026

Kamlesh Kumar

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and others

.....Respondents

With

Writ Petition Service Single No.1810 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1811 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1812 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1813 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1814 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1815 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1816 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1817 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1818 of 2026

Writ Petition Service Single No.1819 of 2026

Presence:-

Mr. Harshpal Sekhon, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Pradeep Hairiya, learned Addl. C.S.C. with Mr. S.S. Chaudhary, learned S.C. and Mr. Hargovind Pant, learned B.H. for the State.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

These writ petitions have been filed by the petitioner(s) seeking parity of pay scale with Data Entry Operator working with the respondent employed through U.P.N.L.

2. Since common questions of fact and law are involved in these petitions, therefore, these petitions are clubbed together and decided by this common judgment. However, for the sake of brevity and convenience, facts of WPSS No.1808 of 2026 alone are being considered and discussed.

3. Petitioner was engaged as a contractual Data Entry Operator under the Samagra Shiksha Uttarakhand



at Block Resource Centre (B.R.C.) Tarikhet, District-Almora, in the year 2008, initially for a period of one year and subsequently the period of his engagement was extended and he is working on the said post till date as contractual Data Entry Operator.

4. Petitioner is being paid ₹5,500/- per month as consolidate remuneration which was enhanced from time to time and at present he is getting ₹18,000/- as remuneration. The petitioner claimed parity with Data Entry Operator who were engaged with the respondent-Department through U.P.N.L. and are getting a monthly remuneration of ₹27,299.63/-.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the petitioner is discharging the same function as are being discharged by the Data Entry Operator employed through U.P.N.L. therefore he is entitled to get the same remuneration on the basis of “equal pay for equal work”.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that for the said relief the petitioner has filed a representation to respondent no.2-State Project Director for redressal of his grievance and he submits that if a direction is issued to respondent no.2-State Project Director to decide the said representation, within a stipulated time, the ends of justice would be met.

7. Learned counsel for the State submits that the representation which the petitioner indicated is not by petitioner rather it is through his Union and therefore it would be difficult for respondent no.2 to decide the same, however he submits that if the petitioner may be permitted to file a fresh representation to respondent no.2 within a stipulated time, the respondent no.2 shall decide the same if directed by the Court.

8. In such view of the matter, all the writ petitions



2026:UHC:5786

are finally stand disposed of. Petitioner of each of these writ petitions are permitted to file a representation ventilating their grievance regarding equal pay for equal work at par with the Data Entry Operator engaged through U.P.N.L. within ten days' from today and if such a representation is submitted by the petitioner(s) individually, the respondent no.2 shall decide the same within a period of eight weeks' from the date of receipt of the representations, strictly in accordance with law.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

14.07.2026

SK
SHUBHAM
KAPRUWAN