



2026:CGHC:10595

2026:CGHC:10595
NAFR**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR****WPS No. 2587 of 2023**

Shankar Lal Sonwani S/o Late Shri Bhukhan Lal Sonwani Aged About 54 Years R/o Nayapara, Sonmooda, Raigarh, Police Station - Mohan Jute Mill, Post - Railway Station Chowk, Tehsil And District - Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).

... Petitioner**versus**

1 - State of Chhattisgarh Through- Secretary, Department of Public Health And Engineering Department, Mahanadi Bhawan, Mantralaya, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

2 - Engineer- In - Chief Public Health And Engineering Department, Mantralaya, Mahanadi Bhawan, Atal Nagar, Nava Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh

3 - Superintendent Engineer Public Health And Engineering Department, Bilaspur Circle, Bilaspur, Chhattisgarh

4 - Executive Engineer Mechanical Division, Public Health And Engineering Department, District - Raigarh (Chhattisgarh).

... Respondents

(Cause-title taken from Case Information System)

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Abhishek Singh, Advocate
For State/Respondents	:	Mr. Ujjawal Choubey, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Amitendra Kishore Prasad, Judge
Order on Board

28.02.2026

1. The petitioner has filed this writ petition with the following prayers:-

"10.1. The Hon'ble High Court may kindly be pleased to call for the entire records pursuant to case of petitioner.

10.2 Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to direct respondent authority to provide the pay scale equivalent to pump attendant to the petitioner from 04/11/1992.



10.3 Any other relief, which Hon'ble Court deems fit and proper may also kindly be granted to the Petitioner in the interest of justice.

10.4 Cost of the Petition be also awarded.”

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as Wireman Grade-II on 07.10.1989 in the work-charged establishment and has been discharging duties identical to those of Filter Attendant and Pump Attendant. Despite parity in qualifications, nature of work and responsibilities, and despite the competent authority having recommended removal of the pay anomaly, the petitioner has not been granted the revised pay scale of Rs. 825-15-900-20-1220/- which has been extended to similarly situated employees. Even communication dated 30.01.2009 directed that the discrepancy be removed, yet the benefit has not been extended to him. It is contended that such action is arbitrary and discriminatory, especially when documentary material reflects that the pay scales of Wireman, Pump Attendant and Filter Attendant were shown as identical in subsequent revisions. Denial of equal pay for equal work amounts to violation of Articles 14 and 39(d) of the Constitution of India, and therefore, the petitioner is entitled to grant of the revised pay scale along with consequential benefits.
3. On the other hand, learned State counsel opposes the submissions advanced on behalf of the petitioner and submits that the pay scale in question has already been approved vide order dated 24.01.2000 and, therefore, no further consideration is warranted in the matter.
4. Considering the matter in its entirety, this Court has bestowed its anxious consideration to the rival submissions advanced by learned



counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record, without entering into the merits of the claim set forth by the petitioner and expressing any opinion on the entitlement of the revised pay scale, this Court is of the considered view that the ends of justice would be met if the grievance of the petitioner is directed to be examined by the competent authority in accordance with law. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to submit a fresh, comprehensive representation along with all relevant documents before the competent authority within a period of 15 days from the date of receipt of a certified copy of this order. Upon receipt of such representation, the respondent authorities shall consider the same objectively and pass a reasoned and speaking order, strictly in accordance with applicable rules and circulars, within a further period of 45 days thereafter.

5. With the aforesaid observations and directions, the instant petition stands **disposed of**.

Sd/-

(Amitendra Kishore Prasad)
Judge