



HIGH COURT OF UTTARAKHAND AT NAINITAL

Writ Petition Service Single No. 1779 of 2026

13 July, 2026

Deepak Lal Chaniyal & others

--Petitioners

Versus

State Of Uttarakhand & others

--Respondents

Presence:-

Mr. Harendra Belwal, learned counsel for the petitioners.

Mr. Narayan Dutt, learned Standing Counsel for the State/respondent nos.1 & 2.

Mr. S.S. Chauhan, learned counsel for respondent nos.3 to 8.

Hon'ble Pankaj Purohit, J.

By means of present writ petition, petitioners have sought the following reliefs:-

“(i) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to sanction & release the upgraded pay scale of Rs.5000-8000 (Revised Pay Band Rs.9300-34800 with Grade Pay Rs.4200) on a notional basis, w.e.f. 01.04.2001, for the post of Draftsman, and to pay the consequential arrears to the petitioners.

“(ii) Issue a writ, order or direction in the nature of mandamus commanding the respondents to decide upon the pending application/letter dated 27.11.2024 (Annexure No.12, page 61-63) sent by the Chief Engineer to the Secretary (Pey Jal), Government of Uttarakhand, Dehradun within a stipulated time frame.”

2. It is the case of the petitioners that they were appointed as Draftsmen in the Uttarakhand Pey Jal Nigam on different dates against duly sanctioned and vacant posts and have been continuously discharging their duties since their respective appointments. The Government of Uttarakhand, vide Government Order dated 12.09.2011, upgraded the pay scale of the post of Draftsman in the Pey Jal Nigam from Rs.4,000–6,000 to



Rs.5,000–8,000, followed by a consequential implementation letter dated 29.09.2011 issued by the Finance Director, Uttarakhand Pey Jal Nigam. It is further stated that the pay anomaly in respect of the post of Draftsman has also been removed in the Irrigation, Public Works and Forest Departments by granting the upgraded pay scale of Rs.5,000–8,000 (Revised Pay Band Rs.9,300–34,800 with Grade Pay Rs.4,200) with retrospective effect from 01.04.2001. Despite the petitioners being similarly situated, they have been denied the benefit of the upgraded pay scale. Although the Chief Engineer recommended grant of the said benefit vide letter dated 27.11.2024, no decision has yet been taken by the respondents.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that denial of the upgraded pay scale to the petitioners is arbitrary, discriminatory, and violative of the constitutional principle of "Equal Pay for Equal Work." He further submits that the Chief Engineer has already recommended the grant of the upgraded pay scale vide communication dated 27.11.2024, yet the respondents have failed to take a final decision.

4. Learned counsel appearing for respondent-Pey Jal submits that the issue has already been considered by the competent authority and the matter has been forwarded to the State Government for its consideration, where it is presently pending.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have moved a joint representation dated 23.03.2026 to the Competent Authority.

6. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the writ petition is disposed of finally with a



direction to the State Government/Competent Authority to consider and decide the joint representation of the petitioners, submitted by them, if not already decided, as expeditiously as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of production of a certified copy of this order, in accordance with law, by passing a reasoned and speaking order.

7. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of accordingly.

(Pankaj Purohit, J.)
13.07.2026

AK