

COCP No. 2287 of 2017 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: JULY 05, 2019

GURDEEP SINGH & ORS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

RAVI BHAGAT & ORS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Ms. Jigyasa Tanwar, Advocate
for the petitioners.Mr. R.S. Khosla, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Sarvesh Malik, Advocate
for respondents No.3 and 4.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The present contempt petition has been filed alleging wilful disobedience of the order dated 17.12.2012 passed by this Court in CWP No. 1954 of 2012. The operational part of the order is reproduced below:-

“In view of the afore-said statement of learned counsel for the respondents, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to the respondents to consider the case of the petitioners in the light of the judgment of Hon'ble the Supreme Court whereby the challenge is to the Full Bench judgment of this Court rendered in Avtar Singhs's case (supra).”

The bone of contention in the entire litigation was that equal pay for equal work should be given and the daily wagers should be awarded the minimum pay scale.

Respondents No.3 and 4 had filed a reply stating that compliance of order dated 17.12.2012 of this Court was made and in pursuance thereto, an order dated 13.05.2019 has been passed whereby, petitioners have been granted minimum pay scales.

The grievance raised by the learned counsel for the petitioners is that while deciding the cases of the petitioners they have been granted minimum pay scale minus allowances whereas, in the other cases minimum pay scale has been granted.

Learned counsel for respondents No.3 and 4 submits that there is only difference of usage of terms. Even in other similarly situated cases, minimum pay scale minus allowances are granted.

In view of the above, the direction of this Court has been complied with and no further order is required to be passed in contempt petition.

Accordingly, the same is dismissed as having been rendered infructuous. The rule issued against the respondents is hereby discharged.

However, it is clarified that if any grievance survives, petitioners would be at liberty avail remedies as are available in accordance with law.

JULY 05, 2019
sham

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned ***Yes/No***
Whether reportable ***Yes/No***