

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 1237 of 2018**

1. Ashok Kumar Patel S/o Late Vidyadhar Patel Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Mandara, Post Hirri Tahsil And P.S. Baramkela, District Raigarh Chhattisgarh., District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
2. Neelkamal Chaudhari S/o Ramprasad Chaudhari Aged About 28 Years R/o Village Kadlisarar, Post Birnipali, Tahsil Baramkela, Police Station Dongaripali, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
3. Shyam Kumar Banjare S/o Budlu Banjare Aged About 28 Years R/o Village, Post Baghuod, Tahsil Dabhra, Police Station Dabhra, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh
4. Dharmendra Kumar Manjhwari S/o Hariram Manjhwari Aged About 39 Years R/o Village Boirdadar, Vinobanagar Raigarh, Police Station Chakradharnagar, District Raigarh, Chhattisgarh, District : Raigarh, Chhattisgarh
5. Santosh Kumar Banjare S/o Samaru Ram Aged About 29 Years R/o Village, Post Baghaud, Tahsil, Police Station Dabhra, District Janjgir Champa, Chhattisgarh, District : Janjgir-Champa, Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. C.G. State Of Power Distribution Comp.Ltd. Through Managing Director Dangniya Raipur Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
2. Executive Director (O And M) Cspdc, Raipur, Chhattisgarh., District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
3. Animesh Raijaya (Contractor) Tiwari Chh, Rajendra Nagar, Bilaspur, District Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh, District : Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

---- Respondents

For Petitioners : Shri K.P.S. Gandhi, Advocate.

Order On Board**26/02/2018**

(1) The petitioners, by way of this petition, seek 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 the

Supreme Court in case of **State of Punjab Vs. Jagjit Singh**¹ in support of their case.

(2) A careful 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 their grievances, 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 light of judgment of the Supreme Court in case of **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 as to cost(s).

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

¹ 2017 (1) SCC 148