

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**WPS No. 2578 of 2018**

1. Kamlesh Parmar S/o Shri Dev Karan Parmar Aged About 34 Years R/o Village And Post- Jamgaon P. S. Narharpur, District- Kanker, Chhattisgarh.
2. Domit Chuvarye S/o Shri Patiram Chuvarye Aged About 47 Years R/o Village And Post Talakursh, P. S. Koror, Kanker, District- Kanker, Chhattisgarh
3. Kailas Baghel S/o Shri Budhbal Ram Aged About 30 Years R/o Village And Post Vishrampur P. S. Vishrampur, District- Kondagaon, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. Chhattisgarh State Of Power Distribution Comp. Ltd. Through- Managing Director Dagniya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Executive Director (O And M), CSPDCL, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
3. Govind Electicals (Contactor), Mahawar Dharamsala, Sihawa, Chowk, District- Dhamtari, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondents

For the Petitioners	:	Shri KPS Gandhi, Advocate
For the Resp. No. 1 & 2	:	Shri Raja Sharma, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sharad Kumar Gupta**Order On Board****25/07/2018**

1. Heard counsel for the parties.
2. 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.
3. 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 employer 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.

4. With the aforesaid observations, the writ petition stands finally disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)
Judge