

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Writ Petition (S) No.1144 of 2017**

1. Shiv Kumar Soni S/o Shyam Sundar Soni, Aged About 46 Years R/o Village & Post Sighola, P.S. Lal Bag, Rajnandgaon, Distt. Rajnandgaon (Chhattisgarh)
2. Mahesh Kumar Sahu, S/o Dharamdas Sahu, Aged About 30 Years R/o Village Diwanjhitiya, Post Diwanbhedi, P.S. Dongargaon, Distt. Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh)
3. Manoj Kumar Nishad, S/o Pardeshiram Nishad, Aged About 37 Years R/o Village Diwanjhitiya, Post Diwanbhedi, P.S. Dongargaon, Distt. Rajnandgaon, (Chhattisgarh).

---- **Petitioners****Versus**

1. C.G. State Of Power Distribution Comp. Ltd Through Managing Director, Dangniya, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
2. Executive Director (O & M), C S P D C L, Raipur, (Chhattisgarh)
3. M/s J B S Enterprises Pvt. Ltd., Through Managing Director, Thane, 8/2 Virndraavan Society, 400601, Distt Thane (Maharashtra).

---- **Respondents**

For Petitioners : Shri KPS Gandhi, Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order On Board****08/03/2017**

1. The petitioners by way of this petition seeks a direction to the respondents for paying salary at par with the regular employees in the department on the basis of "Equal Pay For Equal Work". The petitioners rely upon the judgment of Supreme Court in case State of Punjab & Jagjit Singh and Others, 2017(1) SCC 148.
2. However, a perusal of record shows that the petitioners till date have not made any representation to the employer for redressal of their grievances. Without representation being made to the employer for

redressal of grievance, this petition at this juncture would be premature and the same is declined from being entertained. However, the petitioners are at liberty to approach the respondents by making a detailed representation in the light of judgment of Supreme Court in case of State of Punjab Vs. Jagjit Singh (Supra). In case such a representation is made, it is expected then the authorities concerned shall look into the matter and pass appropriate orders in accordance with rules. The petitioners are at liberty to re-agitate, if situation so warrants.

3. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order asto costs.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge