

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR**WPS No. 2619 of 2018**

1. Girish Kumar S/o Shri Rajesh Kumar, Aged About 44 Years R/o Village Khairjhitty, Post Dumardih (Khurd), Police Station Ghumka, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh.
2. Tulesh Kumar, S/o Shri Jagannaath Nishad, Aged About 43 Years R/o Village Sursuli, Post Nahanda, Tahsil Dondilohara, Police Station Devri, District Balod Chhattisgarh
3. Hemant Kumar Yadav, S/o Shri Manthir Yadav, Aged About 32 Years R/o Village Khairjhiti, Post Dumardihikhurd, Tahsil Dondilohara, Police Station Ghumka, District Rajnandgaon Chhattisgarh

---- Petitioners**Versus**

1. C.G. State Of Power Distribution Comp. Ltd. Through Managing Director Dangniya, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
2. Executive Director (O & M) CSPDCL, Raipur Chhattisgarh.
3. Contactor, JBS Enterprises, Thane Mumbai, Police Station Thane, District Mumbai (Maharashtra)

----Respondents

For Petitioners	:	Mr. K.P.S. Gandhi, Advocate
-----------------	---	-----------------------------

Hon'ble Shri Justice P. Sam Koshy**Order on Board****27/03/2018**

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 as to costs.

Sd/-
(P. Sam Koshy)
Judge

Ved