



2026:UHC:4832

HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No.1550 of 2026

15th June, 2026

Saurabh Kumar Thapliyal and othersPetitioners

Versus

State of Uttarakhand and anotherRespondents

Presence:-

Mr. Prem Prakash Singh Phartiyal, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Sushil Vashistha, learned S.C. for the State/respondent no.1.

Mr. B.S. Negi, learned counsel for respondent no.2.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

This writ petition has been filed by the petitioners on the premise that they were engaged as Multi Purpose Employees with respondent no.2-Nagar Palika Parishad in 2016 and they are still working as Multi Purpose Employees.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are being paid consolidated salary amounting to ₹19,606/- and after deduction the petitioners are getting ₹15,171/-. He further submits that petitioners have been working since long and their service are required to facilitate smooth functioning of respondent no.2-Nagar Palika Parishad.

3. The work and conduct of the petitioners is found to be satisfactory and unblemished and the nature of the work discharged by the petitioners is perennial in nature.

4. By means of this writ petition, petitioners have sought the following reliefs:-

“(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondent no.2 to pay minimum pay scale as per recommendation of 7th Pay Commission including dearness allowance and arrears to the petitioners as being paid to the regularly appointed employees in the respondent no.2-Department in accordance with law.



2026:UHC:4832

(ii) Permit the petitioner to continue the work in the department of respondent no.2 and pay salary in monthly basis.”

5. It is admitted by learned counsel for the petitioners that petitioners have not made any demand to the respondent-Nagar Palika Parishad for minimum pay-scale. Though oral demands have been made by the petitioners. But oral demand has no meaning in the eyes of law and petitioners before approaching this Court should have made a demand by moving representation(s) to respondent no.2 for payment of minimum pay-scale to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly writ petition stands disposed of finally, giving liberty to the petitioners to move representation(s) ventilating their grievance, in detail, to the respondent no.2 within two weeks from today and if such representation(s) is filed by the petitioners, the respondent no.2 shall pass a reasoned and speaking order thereon, in accordance with law, within a further period of eight weeks.

7. In the meantime, it is provided that services of the petitioners shall not be terminated merely on the ground that they have approached this Court.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)

15.06.2026

SK