

**Resource document: Compilation of notable judgements delivered by the Supreme Court of India.**

This resource document captures and encapsulates the existing position of law on rights of persons with disabilities in India. This is done through collation of notable judgements delivered by the Supreme Court of India with respect to the primary legislation on the subject, the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. The extant legislation being fairly recent, progressive judgements of its predecessor, Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 have also been included. Care has been taken to ensure that the database contains only those rights and duties enunciated by the Court which continue to hold and are considered to be good law, in application in the country. The judgements for the said purpose were identified through the legal research platform 'SCC Online'. This document has been prepared in plain English with due care to ensure that the essence of the Court's observations has not been compromised. It has been prepared as such to serve as a primer for the public at large, particularly persons with disabilities in understanding the law, the rights and duties pertaining to them for their respective personal or professional requirements.

**List of Abbreviations:**

- **RPwD Act, 2016** : Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016
- **PwD Act, 1995**: Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995
- **SC**: Supreme Court

Database of Judgements of Supreme Court of India

| S. No. | Year / Bench Size          | Relevant legal provisions | Summary of Judgment   | Right   | Tags                |
|--------|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|---|---------------------|
| 1.     | 2022,<br>Division<br>Bench | NA                        | <p><a href="#"><u>State Bank of India &amp; Anr. v Ajay Kumar Sood, 2022 SCC OnLine SC 1067:</u></a></p> <p>The case was based upon the “incomprehensibility of an impugned judgement”. The SC was met with an immaculate task to decipher and analyse the impugned judgement and provide a conclusive judgement. While emphasising upon the intelligibility, clarity and comprehensiveness of judgement, SC also talked about the importance of accessibility of judgements for persons with disability.</p> <p>The court held that it is crucial to ensure accessibility in judgments and orders for individuals with disabilities, particularly those with visual impairments who rely on screen readers. To achieve this, judicial institutions should refrain from using improperly placed watermarks that hinder access. Additionally, courts and tribunals should upload accessible versions of judgments and orders, digitally signed, rather than scanned copies of printed documents. The court condemned the practice of printing and scanning as time-consuming and pointless, arguing that it creates barriers for a wide range of citizens. Thus, the court emphasised the need to eradicate this practice from the litigation process.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to access judgements delivered by the courts and tribunals.</li> </ul> | Legal Accessibility |

|    |                           |  |   |  |  |
|----|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| 2. | 2021,<br>3 Judge<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section 2, 3, 10,<br>16, 17, 81 | <p><a href="#"><u>Rajneesh Kumar Pandey &amp; Ors. v Union of India &amp; Ors., 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1005:</u></a></p> <p>The issue in the present was the determination of the appropriate pupil-teacher ratio to be maintained by schools admitting children with special needs (CwSN).</p> <p>SC in this judgement directed changes to the schedule to the Right of Children to Free and Compulsory Education Act, 2009, concerning the education of CwSN. The Central Government to establish a specific ratio of special teachers or rehabilitation professionals per student in all schools that admit CwSN. As an interim solution, the Court defined the ratios for different disabilities, such as 8:1 for cerebral palsy, 5:1 for intellectual disability, autism spectrum disorder, and specific learning disabilities, and 2:1 for deaf-blindness or a combination of these disabilities. The Court also outlined a roadmap for integrating special educators into schools that accommodate CwSN. The roadmap includes the creation of permanent positions, a time-bound appointment process, and training and awareness programs for all teachers regarding the additional requirements of CwSN. Furthermore, the Court directed the State Commissioners of Persons with Disabilities to monitor compliance with the Court's roadmap throughout the country.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to meaningful and effective education and training to children with special needs.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Education, Reasonable accommodation.</b></p> |
|----|---------------------------|--|---|--|--|

|    |                            |  |  |  |                           |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| 3. | 2021,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 32, 33,<br>and 47. | <p><a href="#"><u>State of Kerala &amp; Ors. v. Leesamma Joseph. (2021) 9 SCC 208:</u></a></p> <p>The issue before the SC was whether persons with disabilities were entitled to reservation in promotion. The Court interpreted the provisions of the PwD Act, 1995 and RPwD Act, 2016 while deciding the issue.</p> <p>The Court held that persons with disabilities are entitled to reservation in promotion under the scheme of the PwD Act, 1995. The Court further noted that while it is easier to enact legislation, changing the societal mindset to give effect to the good intentions of the legislation in the true sense is a difficult task. The intention of the PwD Act, 1995 and RPwD Act, 2016 is to ensure that persons with disabilities are provided with equal opportunity, and such an opportunity can be provided only by affirmative action like granting them reservation in promotion. Section 20(2) of the RPwD Act, 2016 mandates every government establishment to provide “reasonable accommodation” and a conducive environment for disabled people. The Court concluded that persons with disabilities are entitled to reservations in promotion. The Court also directed the Union Government to formulate executive instructions for reservations in promotion, as provided under Section 34 of the RPwD Act, 2016. The same had not been done till then but was done pursuant to the Court’s directions.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to reservation in promotion.</li> </ul> | Reasonable accommodation. |
|----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---------------------------|

|    |                           |  |  |  |   |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 4. | 2021,<br>3 Judge<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016,<br>Section 20(4),<br>47, 102 | <p><a href="#"><u>Ravinder Kumar Dhariwal &amp; Anr. v. Union of India &amp; Ors., 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1293:</u></a></p> <p>Appellant was employed in the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF). He was diagnosed with and undergoing treatment for obsessive-compulsive disorder. CRPF initiated disciplinary proceedings against the petitioner on grounds of misconduct. The appellant claimed that he had mental illness to avoid penalties for misconduct. The respondents argued that the Mental Healthcare Act was inapplicable since it was enacted in 2017 whereas the misconduct was committed by the Appellant between 2010 and 2014.</p> <p>The Court ruled that the right of the Government to exempt establishments to not discriminate against persons with disabilities under Section 3(3) of the RPwD Act, 2016 is not absolute and is subject to a proportionality analysis. It further observed that on account of his mental disability the employee was more vulnerable to engage in such behaviour which may be classified as misconduct. Therefore, subjecting him to disciplinary proceedings on this ground without taking the same into consideration would amount to indirect discrimination. The Court observed that the facets of non-discrimination that guide the PwD Act, 1995 are not restricted in their applicability to Section 47 of the PwD Act, 1995. It further held that while Section 47 is considerably narrower than Section 20(4) of the RPwD Act 2016, nonetheless, the overarching principle of substantive equality mandated the Government to provide reasonable accommodation to persons affected by any kind of disability, even under the PwD Act, 1995, especially when the disability was acquired during the course of the employment. The Government was additionally obligated to shift such an employee who acquired a disability to a suitable position with the same pay scale and benefits. Accordingly, SC directed CRPF to reassign the petitioner to an equivalent post with the same pay and benefits.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rights to reasonable accommodation, being a facet of the right of persons with disabilities to non-discrimination is available even under the PwD Act, 1995.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Indirect Discrimination, Employment, Mental Healthcare Act, 2017, Mental Illness, Reasonable Accommodation.</b></p> |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|--|---|

|    |                      |  |  |   |  |
|----|----------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 5. | 2021, Division Bench | <p><b>RPwD Act, 2016: Section 2(r), 2(s), 2(m), 2 (y), 3, 17(i), 18, 31, 32, 33, 34,35, 36 and 37.</b></p> | <p><a href="#"><u>Avni Prakash v. National Testing Agency &amp; Ors., 2021 SCC OnLine SC 1112:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellant was affected by writer’s cramp, a disorder that prevents an individual from writing in a consistent and coherent fashion. As per the Guidelines for Conducting Written Examination for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities issued by the Union Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India, candidates such as the appellant are entitled to at least one hour of compensatory time for a 3-hour exam. The Appellant appeared for the National Eligibility-Cum-Entrance Test [NEET] for admission to a medical college at the undergraduate level. In this case, despite being entitled to a compensatory additional hour for attempting the examination as per the prescribed guidelines, Prakash was denied reasonable accommodation and her paper was confiscated after only three hours.</p> <p>The Bombay High Court denied relief to the Appellant appellant on the ground that she was not entitled to an additional hour of compensatory time because of a failure to obtain the prescribed disability certificate.</p> <p>It was the Appellant’s case that the prescribed disability certificate had to be furnished at the stage of admission rather than examination.</p> <p>The SC accepted the Appellant’s argument. It observed that disturbance in ranks of examination results cannot be the reason for denying a person with disability a remedy. It further held that the exam centre’s failure to provide Appellant compensatory time was attributable to inadequate knowledge at the designated centre. The Court directed the National Testing Agency to formulate and report an appropriate remedy to rectify the injustice to the Appellant. It further directed personnel training for concerned officials for adequate implementation of the provisions made for PwD and securing reasonable accommodation.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Compensatory time is part of the right to reasonable accommodation.</li> <li>• Mandate to remedy injustice meted out to persons with disabilities on account of appropriate sensitivity training.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Compensatory time, Education, Examination, Higher education, Medical Education, NEET, Reasonable Accommodation, Writer’s Cramp, Physical Disability, Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016</b></p> |
|----|----------------------|--|--|---|--|

|    |                            |   |  |  |   |
|----|----------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| 6. | 2021,<br>Division<br>Bench | <p><b>RPwD Act, 2016:</b><br/>Section 2(c), 2(h), 2(r), 2(s), 2(zc), 2(y), 3, 17, 20, 35, 44, 56, 57.</p> <p><b>PwD Act, 1995:</b><br/>Section 2(c), 2(i), 2(r), 2(s), 2(t), 31</p> | <p><a href="#"><u>Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission &amp; Ors., (2021) 5 SCC 370:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellant, who had dysgraphia, requested a scribe for the 2018 UPSC Civil Service Examination. However, UPSC denied the request based on the exam rules that allowed a scribe only for blind candidates or those with certain disabilities. The Appellant approached the Central Administrative Tribunal, which initially directed UPSC to provide a scribe, but later dismissed the request as the Appellant lacked a disability certificate and hadn't made previous requests for a scribe. The Appellant then challenged the Tribunal's decision and the exam rules in the Delhi High Court. The High court declined to interfere with the Tribunal's order, citing that the Appellant's failure to qualify the Preliminary Examination rendered the relief sought otiose.</p> <p>This order of the High Court was challenged before SC. The Appellant contended that the 2018 Civil Services Examination Rules violated Section 20 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, which mandates reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities regardless of having a benchmark disability. He argued that the Act distinguishes between "persons with disability" and "persons with benchmark disabilities" for reservation purposes, but not for reasonable accommodation. UPSC argued that the Appellant's request for a scribe should be based on the rules for the 2018 Civil Services Examination, not Section 20 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. They contended that the Appellant's condition, Writer's Cramp, was not listed as a specified disability, and the use of a scribe was being misused, therefore threatening the integrity of the exam.</p> <p>Union of India argued that the Appellant's condition, writer's cramp, was not recognized as a disability according to the guidelines and the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, making the guidelines inapplicable. They also expressed concern that granting scribe facility to candidates with less than a 40% disability could lead to misuse and compromise fair competition.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons with non-benchmark disabilities have a right to avail a scribe to appear in any exam conducted by the Government.</li> <li>• Denying a reasonable accommodation constitutes discrimination against persons with disabilities, irrespective of the extent of the person's disability.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Civil Services Examination, Discrimination, Dysgraphia, Employment, Examination, Reasonable Accommodation, Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, Scribe, Writer's cramp.</b></p> |
|----|----------------------------|---|--|--|---|

|    |                           |   |  |   |  |
|----|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
|    |                           |   | The court held that the definition of 'persons with disabilities' should not be limited by quantification. Providing reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities is a positive obligation of the state, as it ensures equal participation in society. Misuse of the scribe facility should be addressed separately, and the Appellant was entitled to use a scribe in the Civil Services Examination and other government competitive exams.   |   |  |
| 7. | 2020,<br>1 judge<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section NA.<br>PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section NA. | <p><a href="#"><u>Patan Jamal Vali v. State of Andhra Pradesh, 2021 SCC OnLine SC 343:</u></a></p> <p>The case was about the rape of a girl with visual impairment belonging to a Scheduled Caste. The SC affirmed the conviction of the appellant for rape of the girl with visual impairment. The court discussed that it is imperative to take into account the intersectionality while determining the case.</p> <p>The court emphasised that threats against women with disabilities in India are not uncommon and can lead to feelings of powerlessness. However, the court clarified that by this they did not mean to subscribe to the stereotype that persons with disabilities are weak and helpless, rather aim to highlight the increased vulnerability in such cases, and cited reports such as the 2018 report by Human Rights Watch. The court also gave certain guidelines including the need for Awareness-raising campaigns, in accessible formats, to inform women and girls with disabilities, about their rights when they are at the receiving end of any form of sexual abuse. Moreover, it was held that testimony of a prosecutrix with a disability, or of a disabled witness for that matter cannot be considered weak or inferior and must be given due credence, at an equal footing as that of their able-bodied counterparts.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Testimony of a witness with disability cannot be considered inferior to that of their able-bodied counterparts only on account of the disability.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Crimes against Women, Caste-based Violence, Intersectionality, Gender Evidence, Testimony of Person with Disability.</b></p> |



|    |                           |  |  |  |  |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 8. | 2020,<br>3 Judge<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 2(i), 2(t),<br>32, 33. | <p><a href="#"><u>Siddaraju v. State of Karnataka &amp; Ors.. (2020) 19 SCC 572:</u></a></p> <p>In this case, the SC was seized with a reference to consider the issue of whether persons with disabilities as defined in Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995, can be granted reservation in promotion.</p> <p>The respondents argued that the prohibition on reservation in promotions, as established in <i>Indra Sawhney &amp; Others v. Union of India &amp; Others, (1992) Supp. 3 SCC 215</i>, applies to both Article 16(4) and 16(1) of the Indian Constitution. They contended that while persons with disabilities may require preferential treatment, reservation in promotions cannot be provided for them.</p> <p>The SC in this case affirmed its earlier view rendered in <i>Rajeev Kumar Gupta v. Union of India</i>. It was held that the statutory benefit of 3% must be granted to persons with disabilities because once a seat has been identified under Section 33 of the PwD Act, 1995, it must be filled only by persons with disabilities. If a seat has been reserved under Section 33, then it establishes that the duties expected from a person holding that seat can be fulfilled by persons with disabilities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Persons with disabilities have a right to reservation in promotions as well once the post was created for persons with disabilities.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment, Reservation, Promotion.</b> |
|----|---------------------------|--|--|--|--|

|    |                           |                               |  |     |  |
|----|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----|--|
| 9. | 2019,<br>3 judge<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section 32 | <p><a href="#"><u>Vidhi Himmat Katariya &amp; Ors. v. State of Gujarat &amp; Ors.. (2019) SCC OnLine SC 1318:</u></a></p> <p>The Petitioners in this case were students who were appearing for the NEET Exam for admission to MBBS Courses across the country. They sought to be considered persons with disabilities eligible to claim reservation under the PwD Category. The regulations of Graduate Medical Education in MCI were amended in 2019 and according to its appendix "H", persons with locomotor disability of less than 40% are eligible to pursue MBBS course but are not eligible to be granted the benefit of reservation under PwD category. Therefore, the medical board denied admission to Petitioners under persons with disabilities category by stating that they are not eligible for reservation under this category under the amended Regulations. Petitioners appealed to the Appellate Medical Board, which upheld the previous decision. Therefore, the petitioners approached the SC under Article 32 for relief. The Court ruled in favour of the state and declined to grant admission to the petitioners by stating that it would not be justified to overrule the opinion formed by the medical experts of rejecting the admission under PwD category as they lack expertise and found no merit in petitioner' contention about arbitrary application of Regulations.</p> | N.A | Education,<br>Examination,<br>Higher<br>Education,<br>Medical<br>education, NEET,<br>Reservation,<br>Physical<br>disability. |
|----|---------------------------|-------------------------------|--|-----|--|

|     |                            |  |  |   |  |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 10. | 2019,<br>Division<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section 2(r),<br>2(zc), and 32. | <p><a href="#"><u>Purswani Ashutosh (Minor) through Dr.Kamlesh Virumal Purswani v. Union of India, (2019) 14 SCC 422:</u></a></p> <p>The Petitioner, who appeared for the NEET UG Examination for the 2018-19 session was denied benefit of reservation for persons with disabilities, despite having low vision impairment and being eligible for 5% reservation for specific benchmark disability under the RPwD Act, 2016 and MCI's Medical Education Regulation 4(3). An MCI expert committee determined that individuals with a visual impairment below 40% would not be admitted to the MBBS course. Aggrieved by this he approached the Court.</p> <p>Section 32 of the RPwD Act, 2016 provides for reservation only in higher educational institutions, within the definition of which technical education institutions do not fall. Higher education is a general term; it includes all kinds of higher education institutions such as technical education, etc. But the term technical education is a specific term which refers to institutions which impart technical education.</p> <p>The court, rejecting the opinion of the committee, held that its opinion cannot be allowed to override a statutory provision (Medical Regulations) mandating medical institutions to provide 5% reservation to persons with disabilities. It held that the RPwD Act, 2016 as well as Medical Regulations by MCI were binding on the institution and thus no expert committee's opinion could be given primacy over the same. Thus, it held that the petitioner cannot be denied admission if he qualifies as per his merit in the category of persons with disabilities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to be considered for admission to educational institutions and related benefits.</li> <li>• Persons with specified benchmark disability with low vision are eligible to secure admission to reserved seats for an MBBS.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Higher Education, Technical Education, Reservation, Medical Education, NEET.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|

|     |                            |  |  |  |   |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 11. | 2018,<br>Division<br>Bench | <p><b>RPwD Act, 2016: Section 16(ii), 25(1)(b), and 40.</b></p> <p><b>PwD Act, 1995: Section 39.</b></p> | <p><a href="#"><u>Disabled Rights Group &amp; Anr. v. Union of India &amp; Ors., (2018) 2 SCC 397:</u></a></p> <p>A writ petition was filed by the Disabled Rights Group (DRG), a non-profit organisation working for the rights of persons with disabilities. Three issues were raised by the Petitioners which pertained to education of persons with disabilities. The first contention of the Petitioners was reservation not being provided despite the requirement of reservation of 3% seats in educational institutions under Section 39 of the PwD Act, 1995(now 5% reservation under Section 32, RPwD Act, 2016). The Petitioners further contended that despite there being a legal obligation under Section 16(ii), 25(1)(b) and Section 40 of RPwD Act, 2016 to secure access to persons with orthopaedic disability in educational institutions, the provisions were not being implemented. The third contention was for pedagogical changes-adequate provisions and facilities for teaching persons with disability depending on their special needs.</p> <p>The court ruled that institutions obligated to provide 3% reservation for persons with disabilities must comply and report the list to the relevant authorities. Non-compliant institutions may face legal consequences under RPwD Act, 2016. The court further held that denying proper educational facilities to differently-abled individuals amounts to discrimination. It endorsed a right-based and inclusive approach, promoting the participation of all groups for inclusive development. The UGC was instructed to review the set of suggestions in form of guidelines submitted by the Petitioners to make infrastructure and pedagogy adequate and submit an action-taken report. The court mandated higher educational institutions covered by Section 32 of the RPwD Act, 2016 to adhere to its provisions when admitting students annually.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government-aided higher educational institutions must reserve 5% seats for PwDs.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Higher education, Reasonable accommodation, Reservation</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|

|     |                            |   |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 12. | 2017,<br>Division<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section NA.<br><br>PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section NA. | <p><a href="#"><u>Pranay Kumar Podder v. State of Tripura. (2017) 13 SCC 351:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellants in this case were candidates who were denied admission to MBBS course despite having passed the medical entrance exam, solely on account of their being affected by colour vision deficiency (CVD). They petitioned the Tripura High Court against being debarred in absence of any eligibility instruction, regulations or resolution by Medical Council of India barring them. The High Court dismissed their petitions, relying upon a set of recommendations/ guidelines issued by MCI.</p> <p>They then approach SC in appeal contending that despite there being a distinction between persons with visual impairment and those with CVD, the Medical Council of India treats them equally. They further argued that a complete ban on the admission of individuals affected by colour vision deficiency to medical courses violates the conferment of equal opportunities and fair treatment.</p> <p>The court-appointed amicus curiae argued for progressive measures by the Medical Council of India to avoid discrimination against individuals with CVD, in light of scientific advancements and inclusive culture.</p> <p>The Court acknowledged MCI's guidelines, considering them based on expert recommendations. It ruled that a complete ban on individuals with CVD in medical courses didn't violate equal opportunities. However, the Court instructed the Council to reassess CVD severity and suitable disciplines.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to reasonable accommodation in suitable disciplines.</li> <li>• Right to non-discrimination in admission to professional courses like medicine.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Education, Reasonable Accommodation, Non-discrimination, Equal Opportunities.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|

|     |                            |                              |   |  |  |
|-----|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 13. | 2017,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 32 | <p><a href="#"><u>Union of India &amp; Ors. v. M. Selvakumar &amp; Anr. (2017) 3 SCC 504:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellants in this case were claiming that the number of attempts to take the UPSC Civil Services Examination allowed to persons with disabilities in the OBC category should be increased from 7 to 10. They sought 10 attempts in total, which meant an additional 3 attempts for OBC persons with disabilities. The contention was premised on the decision of Government of India to increase the number of attempts for persons with disabilities under the general category from 4 to 7. The Appellants claimed that there should be a proportionate increase to 10 in the number of attempts available to persons with disabilities in the OBC category-which were already 7, since 2007, when they had been increased from 4 to 7. They contended that denying these additional attempts violated Article 14 and contradicted the intent of the RPwD Act, 2016.</p> <p>The Court distinguished between horizontal and vertical reservation categories, observing that candidates from OBC are entitled to the benefits of vertical reservation separately. The court clarified that equal opportunities for both categories of PwD candidates, i.e., providing 7 attempts, does not amount to discrimination. The relaxation of 3 years enjoyed by OBC candidates is related to vertical reservation and should not be confused with horizontal reservation or seen as discriminatory. The Court further held that merely increasing the number of attempts in the general category did not mean the move was arbitrary or unequal and was merely bringing at par the persons with disabilities from the General as well as OBC category. The Court expanded on the general nature of reasonable accommodation under Article 16 and held that extending concessions and relaxations to PwD candidates was essential to reasonable accommodation and non-arbitrariness.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Providing concessions and relaxations to persons with disabilities is part of the right to reasonable accommodation.</li> </ul> | <b>Examination, Civil Services Examination, Public Employment, Reasonable Accommodation, Other Backward Classes, Reservation, Service Law.</b> |
|-----|----------------------------|------------------------------|---|--|--|

|     |                            |  |  |  |   |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| 14. | 2017,<br>Division<br>Bench | <p><b>RPwD Act, 2016:</b><br/><b>Section 41, 46, 60, 61, 2(i), 2(k), 2(v), 2(w), 2(zd), 2(ze), 16, and 25(1)(b).</b></p> <p><b>PwD Act, 1995:</b><br/><b>Section 44, 45, and 46.</b></p> | <p><a href="#"><u><b>Rajive Raturi v. Union of India &amp; Ors., (2018) 2 SCC 413:</b></u></a></p> <p>A PIL was filed on behalf of the differently-abled persons by the Petitioner, a person with visual impairment for proper, adequate and safe access to public places. The Petitioner sought that all accessibility requirements meet the needs of persons with visual impairment with respect to safe access to roads and transport facilities. These requirements are in the nature of installing auditory signals at red lights, placing warning blocks and unobstructed footpaths, incorporating Braille route maps and schedules, providing designated parking areas, ticketing areas and assistance counters for individuals with visual impairments, creating designated spaces for disabled-friendly coaches at railway stations, erecting protective fencing, positioning sign boards and hoardings above head levels, etc., enable individuals with visual impairments to navigate their surroundings more effectively and reduce the risk of accidents. They also enhance the overall experience and convenience for visually impaired individuals when using public transportation.</p> <p>Upon discussing the contentions of the petitioner, the court gave directions encompassing various aspects of making public spaces and facilities more accessible for individuals with disabilities. These include making government buildings, airports, and railways fully accessible within specific timeframes, conducting accessibility audits and retrofitting in designated cities, ensuring accessibility in public transport carriers and websites, embedding disability aspects in building codes, and establishing Advisory Boards. The court emphasised the importance of meeting these targets within the prescribed deadlines and stated that it expects regular updates and compliance reports from the respective authorities.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Right to Equality-not restricted to preventing discrimination, includes positive, affirmative action.</li> <li>● Right to access public amenities like roads, public transport, etc.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Vision Impairment, ICT, Reasonable Accommodation, Non-Discrimination.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|---|

|     |                            |  |  |   |  |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|
| 15. | 2016,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 2(t), 32,<br>33. | <p><a href="#"><u>Rajeev Kumar Gupta &amp; Ors. v. Union of India &amp; Ors.. (2016) 13 SCC 153:</u></a></p> <p>In this case, multiple petitioners who were employed with Prasar Bharti Corporation of India assailed two office memoranda issued by the Department of Personnel and Training. The Petitioners were 'persons with disability' within the meaning of Section 2 (t) of PwD Act, 1995 who contended that the relevant office memorandums deprived them of the statutory benefit of reservation under the PwD Act, 1995. The memorandum stipulated that for posts identified for persons with disabilities in Group A and B, only direct recruitment will be done. This would tantamount to denial of the benefit of reservation in appointment to these posts.</p> <p>The Respondents argued that Group A and B are posts that are obtained via promotion, and as per the dictum in the case of Indra Sawhney, there is no provision for reservation in promotion. However, the Court disagreed with this argument and reasoned that Article 16(4) does not disable the state from providing reservations to other classes of citizens under Article 16(1).</p> <p>The Court also observed that Sections 32 and 33 of the PwD Act, 1995 reflect the purpose to strike a fine balance between the requirements of the administration and the need to provide adequate opportunities to persons with disabilities. Accordingly, SC declared the impugned memoranda as illegal and violative of the PwD Act, 1995.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reservation in promotion for persons with disabilities is permitted and encouraged, being not violative of any other right.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment, Promotion, Reservation, Affirmative Action.</b> |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|---|--|



|     |                            |                               |  |  |  |
|-----|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 16. | 2016,<br>Division<br>Bench | RPwD Act, 2016:<br>Section 40 | <p><a href="#"><u>Jeeja Ghosh and Anr v. Union Of India &amp; Ors. (2016) 7 SCC 761:</u></a></p> <p>Ms Jeeja Ghosh, a disability rights activist affected by cerebral palsy, was invited to speak at a conference in Goa. To attend the same, she boarded a flight from Kolkata to Goa. However, she was de-seated from the flight due to her disability. This de-seating not only caused financial loss and prevented her from participating in the conference but also shocked, traumatised and humiliated her. She then approached the Court by way of a Public Interest Litigation to put together a system which avoids the repetition of such an event.</p> <p>The Court observed that the airline violated the Civil Aviation Requirements with regard to Carriage by Air of Persons with Disabilities and/or Persons with Reduced Mobility issued by the DGCA. The Court also observed that the response of the airline company was disproportionate and insufficient. The Court awarded exemplary compensation to the Petitioner.</p> <p>The Court issued a slew of directions to the multiple Respondents to ensure that no such incident happens again. Additionally, the Court held that human dignity is part of Article 21 and it is imperative for able-bodied persons to have sensitivity towards specially-abled persons.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Right to be treated with dignity and respect, in all aspects, including air travel.</li> <li>● Duty of individuals and organisations airlines to be sensitive and accommodative.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Reasonable Accommodation, Travel, Air Travel, Dignity.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|--|--|

|     |                            |   |  |   |  |
|-----|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 17. | 2015,<br>Division<br>Bench | <b>RPwD Act, 2016:<br/>Section NA.</b><br><b>PwD Act, 1995:<br/>Section NA.</b> | <p><a href="#"><u>Union of India &amp; Ors. v. Angad Singh Titaria. (2015) 12 SCC 257:</u></a></p> <p>The background of the case is that the Respondent was employed in the Indian Air Force (IAF) and over the years acquired multiple ailments including coronary artery disease, diabetes, etc. The Respondent was superannuated from service and applied for a disability pension. The Medical Board declared the composite disability of the Respondent at 60% but held that the disabilities were constitutional in nature and not attributable to nor aggravated by the respondent's service in the IAF (Regulation 153 of the Pension Regulations for IAF, 1961). Accordingly, the Respondent's application for a disability pension was denied by the competent authority and his appeals to the first and second Appellate Committee rejected.</p> <p>The Armed Forces Tribunal(AFT) on appeal granted him disability pension with arrears.</p> <p>In appeal, the Court upheld the order of the AFT. SC held that the Respondent was deemed to be fit when enrolled in the service. It was over the course of the years while being in service, that the Respondent acquired the disabilities. SC held that in absence of any proof that the Respondent was affected by either of these disabilities prior to his joining the service, it would be deemed that the Respondent acquired these disabilities during the course of his service. Additionally, the Court held that it was the burden of the Medical Board while ruling that the disability was not attributable to the service, to apply its mind and substantiate it with reasons. The Court observed that the order of the Medical Board being unreasoned could not be endorsed, as held by the Tribunal.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Right to Disability Pension if disability is attributable to or aggravated by the service.</li> <li>● Presumption that deterioration in health is attributable to military service.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment,<br/>Military Service,<br/>Disability<br/>Pension, Armed<br/>Forces.</b> |
|-----|----------------------------|---|--|---|--|

|     |                            |   |   |  |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
| 18. | 2014,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 32 and<br>33. | <p><a href="#"><u>Sunanda Bhandare Foundation v. Union of India &amp; Anr.. (2014) 14 SCC 383:</u></a></p> <p>Petitioner, a charitable trust, filed a writ petition seeking implementation of the provisions of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995, including reservation of 1% teaching posts in various universities and a declaration that the denial of appointment to persons with visual impairment in identified posts is violative of their fundamental rights.</p> <p>The Court ruled in favour of the petitioner and directed the Governments, at the centre, the states and U.Ts to implement the provisions of the PwD Act, 1995 immediately and positively by the end of 2014.</p> <p>The Court emphasised that mere creation of legislation is not sufficient to improve the lives of persons with disabilities, implementation is equally important.</p> <p>SC also directed reservation of 1% of the identified teaching posts in the faculties and colleges of various universities in terms of Section 33 of the PwD Act, 1995 for those with blindness and low vision. The Court held that the denial of appointment to persons with visual impairment in the faculties and colleges of various universities in the identified posts is violative of their fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 14 and 15 read with Article 41 of the Constitution of India.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Right to promotion to posts identified for persons with disabilities.</li> <li>● Right to equality and right against discrimination.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Reservation, Promotion, Teaching, Employment, Equality, Non-Discrimination, Implementation.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|

|     |                           |   |  |  |   |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| 19. | 2013,<br>3 Judge<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 32, 33<br>and 41. | <p><a href="#"><u>Union of India &amp; Anr. v. National Federation of the Blind &amp; Ors., (2013) 10 SCC 772:</u></a></p> <p>This was an appeal from a decision of the Delhi High Court wherein a public interest petition had been filed which sought the implementation of Section 33 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995.</p> <p>The High Court had held that the 3% reservation is to be out of those posts which are both identified and unidentified (under Section 32 of the PwD Act, 1995) for the purpose of reservation. Union of India appealed against this claiming that the 3% reservation is only for identified posts under Section 32. The Appellants contended that reservation of 3% of the total seats would result in exceeding the 50% ceiling on reservation of seats.</p> <p>SC held that the reservation of 3% posts is not dependent on identification of posts by the Government. It was held that 3% refers to a part of the total vacancies in cadre strength. The Court observed that 'not less than 3%' means minimum not maximum 3% seats are to be reserved. It held on a conjoint reading of Section 33 and Section 41 that while the former provides for a minimum level of representation of 3% in establishments of appropriate government, the legislature intended to ensure 5% representation in the entire workforce both in public as well as private sector. In so far as the contention of exceeding the 50% reservation ceiling was concerned, the Court held it was applicable only to vertical reservation under Article 16(4) of the Constitution and was inapplicable to reservation in favour of persons with disabilities, a horizontal reservation under Article 16(1).</p> <p>The Court also directed implementation of the 1% reservation for blind and low-vision individuals in true spirit which was not being done.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to minimum 3% reservation not limited to posts identified for persons with disabilities.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Employment, Low Vision, Reservation, Horizontal and Vertical Reservation.</b></p> |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|--|---|

|     |                            |   |   |  |  |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|
| 20. | 2013,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 30(f),<br>30(g) and 31. | <p><a href="#"><u>Sambhavana v. University of Delhi. (2013) 14 SCC 781:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellant filed a petition claiming that the recommendations made by an expert committee to make education accessible for persons with visual impairments were insufficient to ensure reasonable accommodation and equal treatment. While the committee suggested using visual content as a substitute for non-readable material, it made no modifications to assessment criteria. The Committee also proposed alternative subjects for students struggling with mathematics and science, along with tutorial classes if needed. However, the Appellant argued for additional measures such as bridge courses.</p> <p>The Court, agreeing with the Appellant held that what is required is not more orientation but special intensive training of teaching and non-teaching staff. It referred to Section 31 of the PwD Act, 1995 and stated that state and central governments are mandated to develop special devices and aid to make sure that visually impaired students are at par with others and are provided equal opportunities. It held that the University should do more than just provide visual aids, but has to work in congruence with Article 41 of the Constitution of India and look into real grievances that relate to Constitutional and statutory policy. Thus, the Court directed the committee to consider the recommendations of the petitioner.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The right of visually impaired students to equal opportunities in education.</li> <li>• Duty of educational institutions to secure comprehensive, inclusive education.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Education, Accessibility Rights, Affirmative Action, Reasonable Accommodation.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|--|

|     |                            |  |   |  |   |
|-----|----------------------------|--|---|--|---|
| 21. | 2013,<br>Division<br>Bench | <b>PwD Act, 1995:<br/>Section 2(i), 2(l),<br/>2(o), 45, 46 and<br/>47.</b> | <p><a href="#"><u><i>Deaf Employees Welfare Assn. &amp; Anr. v. Union of India &amp; Ors., (2014) 3 SCC 173:</i></u></a></p> <p>This petition was filed seeking a Writ of Mandamus directing the central and state Governments to grant equal transport allowance to their employees affected by hearing impairment as what was being given to those with vision and locomotor impairments. The allowance given to hearing-impaired employees was significantly lower than the allowance granted to the other employees with disabilities. The Court allowed the petition and directed the Respondents to grant transport allowance to speech and hearing-impaired persons at par with those with visual and orthopaedic impairments. The court held that there could be no further discrimination between a person with disability of 'blindness' and a person with disability of 'hearing impairment', noting that no such discrimination had been envisaged under the PwD Act, 1995. It held that equality of law and equal protection of law is afforded to all persons with disabilities while participating in government functions. Even the assumption that a hearing or speech-impaired person is affected less than a blind person is, in effect, marginalising them; and as such, the same benefits must be given to them, as are awarded to others.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right against discrimination between different disabilities.</li> <li>• Right of all persons with disabilities to be afforded equal protection of law and equal participation.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment,<br/>Public Transport,<br/>Reasonable<br/>Accommodation,<br/>Dignity,<br/>Discrimination,<br/>Equality.</b> |
| 22. | 2010,<br>3-judge<br>Bench  | <b>PwD Act, 1955:<br/>Section 2(k) and<br/>47.</b>                         | <p><a href="#"><u><i>Dalco Engineering Private Ltd. v. Satish Prabhakar Padhye &amp; Ors., (2010) 4 SCC 378:</i></u></a></p> <p>The Respondent, an employee of the Appellant private limited company registered under the Companies Act 1956 sought protection against termination of service on account of disability under the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995. The question for consideration before the SC was whether such a private company would fall within the scope of "establishment" as defined under Section 2(k) of the PwD Act, 1995. Additionally, a secondary issue for determination was whether Section 47 of the PwD Act, 1995 which provided for non-discrimination in Government employment could be extended to non-government companies or private companies as well.</p> <p>The SC observed that private companies are not covered under Section 2(k).</p>  | NA   | <b>Employment,<br/>Termination of<br/>Service,<br/>Establishment,<br/>Private Company</b>                                 |

|     |                            |   |   |  |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|--|---|
|     |                            |   | <p>Additionally, a non-government company registered under the Companies Act is not an “establishment” and therefore is not under any obligation of the PwD Act, 1995. Accordingly, the SC also held that employees of such a company cannot claim the defence of Section 47 of the PwD Act, 1995. The Court also held that beneficial socio-economic legislation must be interpreted liberally, but this does not mean that the meaning of such beneficial legislation is stretched beyond the purpose of the PwD Act, 1995. Where express limitations have been imposed by a statute, they must not be ignored, but given due effect.</p>   |  |   |
| 23. | 2010,<br>Division<br>Bench | <b>PwD Act, 1995:<br/>Section 32, 33,<br/>36.</b> | <p><a href="#"><u>Govt. of India v. Ravi Prakash Gupta &amp; Anr., (2010) 7 SCC 626:</u></a></p> <p>In this case, Respondent 1 was a person with vision impairment who appeared for the civil services examination conducted by the Union Public Service Commission and was declared successful. However, he was not given an appointment even though he secured the fifth rank in the merit list prepared for visually impaired candidates.</p> <p>The Appellant contended that the Respondent could not be appointed as there was only one post reserved for persons with vision impairment. Respondent argued that he was eligible to be appointed against a vacancy from the backlog of reserved vacancies. The Appellant argued that reserved posts in all-India service were identified only in 2005 and hence there was no backlog, to which the Respondent responded that that must be calculated on the basis of when the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection, Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 came into force.</p> <p>The Court dismissed the Appeal and held that it is against the legislative intent if the vacancies are contingent on the identification of posts as per Section 32 of the Disabilities Act, 1995 as then indefinite deferral of identification will undermine the purpose of the PwD Act, 1995.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Persons with disabilities cannot be denied employment for non-identification of posts.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment,<br/>All-India Service,<br/>Reservation,<br/>Backlog<br/>Vacancies,<br/>Implementation.</b> |

|     |                           |   |  |   |  |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| 24. | 2009,<br>3 Judge<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section 2(i), 2(q)<br>and 2(r). | <p><a href="#"><u>Suchita Srivastava &amp; Anr. v. Chandigarh Administration. (2009) 9 SCC 1:</u></a></p> <p>An orphaned woman with intellectual disability was impregnated as a result of rape. The Punjab &amp; Haryana High Court determined, without the woman's consent, that it was in her best interests that the pregnancy should be terminated under Section 3 of the Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971 (MTP Act) as she did not have the capacity to take care of a child, nor did she have a parent or guardian to look after her.</p> <p>The Court issued a stay order on the High Court's decision and ruled that the right to reproductive choice is derived from the right to liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. It emphasised that denying a woman the ability to make decisions about her own body would violate her right to privacy. The court distinguished between 'mental illness' and 'mental retardation', stating that a woman's 'mental retardation' does not strip her of the right to make choices regarding her reproductive rights, unlike mental illness where a guardian can make decisions on behalf of the mother as per the MTP Act. Therefore, the court concluded that termination of the woman's pregnancy without her consent could not be ordered.</p> <p>The court also held that it has parens patriae jurisdiction to determine the 'best interest of the party involved, rather than using the "Substituted Judgment" test, which requires the court to make decisions on behalf of the party.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to make decisions is a fundamental right under Article 21 of the Constitution which cannot be taken away merely on the basis of a disability.</li> </ul> | <b>Health, Gender, Medical Termination of Pregnancy, Intellectual Disability, Dignity, Choice.</b> |
|-----|---------------------------|---|--|---|--|



|     |                            |   |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| 25. | 2009,<br>Division<br>Bench | <b>PwD Act, 1995:<br/>Section 2(b), 2(u)<br/>and 47(2).</b> | <p><a href="#"><u>Union of India v. Devendra Kumar Pant &amp; Ors., (2009) 14 SCC 546:</u></a></p> <p>The first Respondent, an employee in the Ministry of Railways was promoted from Senior Research Assistant to Chief Research Assistant, contingent upon him producing a fitness certificate of B1 category. He assailed the imposition of such a condition on his promotion in a petition before the High Court. The first Respondent argued that the imposition of such a condition was violative of Section 47(2) of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995. The HC allowed the petition of the respondent. The Appellant subsequently challenged the order of HC before the SC.</p> <p>The SC interpreted Section 47(2) in this case and concluded that the provision states that a person who is otherwise eligible for promotion cannot be denied the promotion based on disability. However, this does not mean that a person with a disability should be promoted if their disability would hinder their ability to fulfil the duties of the promoted position. The court emphasised that there is a clear distinction between the two scenarios. The first scenario is when promotion is denied solely due to the presence of a disability and its impact on the employee's performance. In such cases, Section 47(2) applies, and the denial based merely on disability is not permissible. However, the second scenario arises when the disability impairs the individual's ability to carry out the responsibilities of the promoted role or poses risks to safety, security, or performance. In this case, Section 47(2) does not apply, as there is a reasonable minimum standard required to meet the job requirements. SC allowed the appeal of the Railways.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right against denial of promotion solely on the ground of disability.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment, Promotion, Non-Discrimination, Service, Medical Standards.</b> |
|-----|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|

|     |                            |                                 |   |  |  |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 26. | 2008,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 19o5<br>Section 47(1). | <p><a href="#"><u>Bhagwan Dass &amp; Anr. v. Punjab State Electricity Board. (2008) 1 SCC 579:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellant, an employee with the Respondent acquired visual impairment and later became completely blind. Owing to his disability, the Appellant could not continue his service and requested for voluntary retirement. The request for voluntary retirement was accepted after rounds of correspondence, but subsequently he sought to withdraw the application after finding out that he was entitled to protection under the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995, and was not under a compulsion to retire. However, his application for withdrawal was turned down by the respondent.</p> <p>The SC observed that the Appellant was a lineman who completely lost his vision and was not aware of his rights, but the Respondent was fully aware of the statutory protections available to him yet went on to deny them. SC held that the termination of the petitioner was illegal and violative of Section 47 of the PwD Act, 1995. Accordingly, the Court restored the service of the petitioner and declared that he would be entitled to all service benefits.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to protection against illegal termination and discrimination at workplace.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Employment, Illegal Termination, Non-Discrimination, Awareness, Visual Impairment.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|--|

|     |                            |                                  |   |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|
| 27. | 2004,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1955:<br>Section 47(2). | <p><a href="#"><u>Union of India v. Sanjay Kumar Jain. (2004) 6 SCC 708:</u></a></p> <p>The Respondent was an employee of the Railways at a Group 'C' post who had qualified for the written test for promotion to a Group 'B' post. Subsequently, he was asked to undergo a medical test, before being called for a viva-voce test. However, in the medical test, he was declared to be visually handicapped and therefore deemed unfit for the promotion. The Respondent challenged this on the grounds of Section 47(2) of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995. The challenge was allowed by the Central Administrative Tribunal and the High Court.</p> <p>The Appellant challenged the orders of CAT and HC before the SC contending that the proviso to Section 47(2) provided that there are certain exceptions to Section 47(2) and the instant case fell into one such category.</p> <p>SC noted that the Government had not issued any notification exempting establishments from the provisions of Section 47(2). Therefore, the Government could not rely on the proviso and the respondent's case was upheld. The Court clarified that the proviso to Section 47(2) grants the power to exempt establishments from the Section, but this power is not unlimited. The Government is required to issue a notification and prescribe the necessary conditions for such exemption. The waiver can only be granted when the Government deems it appropriate to exempt a particular establishment from the provisions of the Section.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right to promotion in absence of notification exempting the establishment.</li> <li>• Exemption under the proviso to Section 47 is not unconditional.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Employment, Exemption, Promotion, Service Law, Medical Test, Visual Disability.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|---|

|     |                            |  |  |  |  |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 28. | 2003,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act,<br>Section 32, 33,<br>38, 47, 2(e),<br>2(i)(v), 2(k), 2(o),<br>2(t) and 2(w). | <p><a href="#"><u>Kunal Singh v. Union of India &amp; Anr.. (2003) 4 SCC 524:</u></a></p> <p>The Appellant, who while serving as a constable in the Special Service Bureau (SSB) suffered a leg injury that rendered his left leg amputated, was terminated from his position after being declared permanently incapacitated for service by a Medical Board. The Appellant challenged this in a writ petition before the High Court contending that he should have been assigned an alternative duty in accordance with his disability, but the High Court dismissed his petition. He then appealed against the HC's decision invoking Sections 2 and 47 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995. The Respondent countered that the petitioner could not be considered a person with a disability under Section 2 of the PwD Act, 1995 due to his permanent incapacitation.</p> <p>The SC, in this case, upheld the rights of the Appellant under the PwD Act, 1995. The court recognized that the Appellant met the definition of a person with a disability under Section 2 of the PwD Act, 1995 and that the disability was acquired during his service. The court emphasised that Section 47 of the Act serves to protect individuals who acquire disabilities while in service, as failure to do so would cause suffering for the affected person and those dependent on them. The court further interpreted Section 47 as a mandatory provision, a part of a socially beneficial legislation aimed at providing equal opportunities, protecting rights, and facilitating full participation for persons with disabilities. Ultimately the Court held that the provision should be interpreted in a manner that supports these objectives rather than hindering them.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Right against termination of a person who acquires disability/ is incapacitated in the course of employment.</li> </ul> | <b>Employment, Termination, Public Employment, Discrimination, Reasonable Accommodation.</b> |
|-----|----------------------------|--|--|--|--|

|     |                            |                               |  |   |   |
|-----|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|
| 29. | 1993,<br>Division<br>Bench | PwD Act, 1995:<br>Section NA. | <p><a href="#"><u>National Federation of Blind v. Union Public Service Commission &amp; Ors., (1993) 2 SCC 411:</u></a></p> <p>National Federation of Blind (NFB), a representative body of visually impaired persons filed this petition seeking a writ in the nature of mandamus directing the Union of India and UPSC to permit the candidates with visual impairments to compete for the Indian Administrative Service and the Allied Services and further to provide them the facility of writing and civil services examination either in Braille-script or with the help of a Scribe.</p> <p>The SC examined the memorandum of the Standing Committee of the Ministry of Welfare which undertook identification of jobs for persons with disabilities. The court discovered that the Government had acknowledged the specific job positions suitable for disabled individuals and had made decisions regarding their recruitment. The departments were expected to add more positions to the list, and the Ministries/Departments were supposed to inform the UPSC about giving preferential treatment to disabled candidates. UPSC had agreed in principle to provide preference. However, the decisions were not implemented for seven years.</p> <p>The Court partly allowed the writ petition and directed the Government of India and UPSC to permit the blind and partially-blind) eligible candidates to compete and write the civil services examination.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The right of reasonable accommodation of blind and partially blind persons to write UPSC examination in either Braille script or with the help of a scribe.</li> </ul> | <p><b>Employment, visual disability, handicap, physical disability.</b></p> |
|-----|----------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---|---|