
(2018) 03 RAJ CK 0128

In the Rajasthan High Court

Case No : Civil Writ Petition No. 2331 of 2018

Govardhan Singh @APPELLANT@Hash State of Rajasthan & Ors

Date of Decision : 06-03-2018

Acts Referred:

Constitution of India, 1950 — Article 226

Citation : (2018) 03 RAJ CK 0128

Hon'ble Judges : ARUN BHANSALI, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Pawan Singh

Final Decision : Disposed Off

Judgement

1. The petitioners have preferred this writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, claiming the following reliefs:

â??A. By an appropriate writ order or direction, the respondents may kindly be directed pay salary to the petitioners in minimum pay scale whi h is

being paid to the regular employees of the respondents of holding the equivalent post of Pump Drivers/Operators from the date of their initial

appointment with all consequential benefits.

B. By an appropriate writ, order or direction, the respondents may kindly be directed to pay monthly salary of the petitioners through cheque/online

payment/RTGS/online banking system and restrained to made cash payment to the petitioners.â??

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner prayed that his representation may be considered by the respondents in light of the judgment passed by the

Honâ??ble Apex Court in the matter of State of Punjab & Ors. Vs. Jagjit Singh & Ors. reported in [(2017) 1 Supreme Court Cases 148. The

relevant portion of the judgment reads as under:

60. Having traversed the legal parameters with reference to the application of the principle of "equal pay for equal work", in relation to

temporary employees (daily-wage employees, ad-hoc appointees, employees appointed on casual basis, contractual employees and the like), the sole

factor that requires our determination is, whether the concerned employees (before this Court), were rendering similar duties and responsibilities, as

were being discharged by regular employees, holding the same/corresponding posts. This exercise would require the application of the parameters of

the principle of "equal pay for equal work" Page 101 101 summarized by us in paragraph 42 above. However, insofar as the instant aspect of

the matter is concerned, it is not difficult for us to record the factual position.

We say so, because it was fairly acknowledged by the learned counsel representing the State of Punjab, that all the temporary employees in the

present bunch of appeals, were appointed against posts which were also available in the regular cadre/establishment. It was also accepted, that during

the course of their employment, the concerned temporary employees were being randomly deputed to discharge duties and responsibilities, which at

some point in time, were assigned to regular employees. Likewise, regular employees holding substantive posts, were also posted to discharge the

same work, which was assigned to temporary employees, from time to time. There is, therefore, no room for any doubt, that the duties and

responsibilities discharged by the temporary employees in the present set of appeals, were the same as were being discharged by regular employees.

It is not the case of the appellants, that the respondent-employees did not possess the qualifications prescribed for appointment on regular basis.

Furthermore, it is not the case of the State, that any of the temporary employees would not be entitled to pay parity, on any of the principles

summarized by us in paragraph 42 hereinabove. There can be no doubt, that the principle of "equal pay for equal work" would be applicable to

all the concerned temporary employees, so as to vest in them the right to claim wages, at par with the minimum of the pay-scale of regularly engaged

Government employees, holding the same post.

61. In view of the position expressed by us in the foregoing paragraph, we have no hesitation in holding, that all the concerned temporary employees,

in the present bunch of cases, would be entitled to draw wages at the minimum

of the payscale (- at the lowest grade, in the regular payscale),
extended to regular employees, holding the same post.â??

3. Consequently, the present writ petition is disposed of with direction to the respondents to consider the representation of the petitioners in terms of
aforesaid precedent law as extracted hereinabove. The needful be done within a
period of 60 days from today.