

**AFR****HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****Writ Petition (S) No. 4632 of 2018**

1. Toran Das Mahant S/o Shri Sonhar Das Mahant Aged About 25 Years R/o Near Pratapganj Civil Court, Sarangarh, Post And Tahsil- Sarangarh, Police Station- Sarangarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
2. Narsingh Sahu S/o Shri Radhacharan Sahu Aged About 27 Years R/o Post Nandeli, Police Station Kotra Road Raigarh, Tahsil And District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
3. Sachidanand Nishad S/o Shri Kubercharan Nishad Aged About 30 Years R/o Post Bondra (Sariya), Tahsil- Baramkela, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
4. Arvind Sahu S/o Shri Santram Sahu Aged About 31 Years R/o Post Nandeli, Police Station Kotra Road Raigarh, Tahsil And District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
5. Jayant Kumar Nishad S/o Shri Mahendra Kumar Nishad Aged About 38 Years R/o Post Naurangpur, Police Station Kotra Road Raigarh, Tahsil And District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
6. Suresh Kumar Sidar Aged About 42 Years R/o Village And Post Regal Pali, Police Station- Pursor, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.
7. Anil Kumar Jangde S/o Shri Mahesh Ram Jangde Aged About 33 Years R/o Village- Bhikhampura, Post- Bonda, Police Station- Sariya, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

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

1. Chhattisgarh State Of Power Distribution Company Limited Through- Managing Director Dangniya, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Executive Director (O & M) CSPDCL, Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
4. Purshtam Patel (Contactor) Putkapuri, Raigarh, District- Raigarh, Chhattisgarh.

**---- Respondents**

---

**For Petitioners****: Mr. KPS Gandhi, Advocate**

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sharad Kumar Gupta****Order On Board****18.07.2018**

Heard.

1. The petitioners, by way of this petition, seeking for 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**<sup>1</sup> in support of their case.
2. A careful perusal of record shows that the petitioners till date have not made any representations 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 costs.

Sd/-

(Sharad Kumar Gupta)  
**JUDGE**

L/-

---

1 2017 (1) SCC 148