HIGH COURT OF JAMMU AND KASHMIR AT JAMMU

WPPIL No.39/2002

Date of Decision: 4/8/2012

Jyotsna Mengi

VS

State and ors.

Coram:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice M.M. Kumar, Chief Justice Hon'ble Mr. Justice Hasnain Massodi, Judge

Appearing Counsel:

For Petitioner(s)

Mr. S.P. Mengi, Advocate.

For Respondent(s)

Mr. Gagan Basotra, AAG for R-1 & 2 Mr. D.C. Raina, Sr. Advocate with Mr. F.A. Natnoo, Advocate for R-3.

 Whether approved for reporting in law journals?

Yes/No

2. Whether approved for publishing

in Press/Media?

Yes/No/Optional

Per Massodi, J

Jammu and Kashmir Persons Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1998 (For short Equal Opportunities Act) is a piece of legislation intended to provide equal opportunities, care, protection, maintenance welfare, training and rehabilitation to differently-abled persons. One of the measures contemplated under the Equal Opportunities Act, to achieve the objects of the Petitioner is aggrieved that the Jammu and to the Jammu and the Jammu and the Jammu and Jammu Areas James Ja

1010010

of purview of the Equal Opportunities Act and resultantly, the percentage of posts required to be reserved under the Equal Opportunities Act for differently-abled persons is not so reserved in case of the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial).

3.

- According to the petitioner, there is no reason for the respondents to deny benefit available to the differently-abled persons aspiring for the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial) and keep the service outside the purview of the Equal Opportunities Act. Though the writ petition was filed in the context of Advertisement Notice No.PSC/Ex-2001/64 dated 04.12.2001 and the posts advertised stand filled up, yet the issue raised in the petition survives and has not lost relevance by efflux of time.
- 4. The Equal Opportunities Act unlike Jammu and Kashmir Reservation Act, 2004 does not ipso facto apply to all the services under the Government. Section 21 empowers the Government to identify posts, in the establishments which can be reserved for the

Sant Teachtrair Files Court of Jacks persons with disabilities. The Government is required to review, revise and up-date such list after regular intervals not exceeding three years. It would be profitable to reproduce Ss. 21 and 22 hereunder;

"21. Identification of posts which can be reserved for persons with disabilities

The Government shall:-

- (a) identify posts, in the establishments which can be reserved for the persons with disabilities;
- (b) at periodical intervals not exceeding three years, review the list of posts identified and up-date the list taking into consideration the development in technology.

22. Reservation of posts

The Government shall appoint in every establishment such percentage of vacancies not has than three percent, for persons or class of persons with disabilities of which one percent, each shall be reserved for persons suffering from:

(i) blindness or low vision; (ii) hearing impairment:

- (ii) hearing impairment;
 (ii) locomotor disability or cerebral palsy, in the posts identified for each disabilities:
- Provided that the Government may, having regard to the type of work carried on in any department or establishment by notification, subject to such conditions, if any, as may be specified in such notification, exempt any establishment from the provisions of this Section."
- 5. The Government obviously has to look into all the aspects like the nature of duty performed by member of service, the challenges of work place, occupational hazards and like factors, while

Male Roghmon High Court of 14th

....

taking a decision whether a post in establishment can be reserved for a person with disabilities. There may be posts that, because of occupational hazards involved, cannot be reserved for differently-abled person, as such, person because of the disability, he is suffering from, may be exposed to bodily injury, if asked to man such post. The Government, therefore, has to make an enquiry regarding the type of disability that may qualify for reservation against the post in an establishment. The disability in terms of Section 22 of the Equal Opportunities Act may be categorized as; (i) blindness or low vision; (ii) hearing impairment; (iii) locomotor disability or cerebral palsy. A person with a particular type of disability may without any inconvenience man a particular post but may not be in a position to man a different post because of the attached to such post. Therefore, while identifying the post, which can be reserved for the persons with disabilities, the Government may having regard to different categories of disabilities take a decision whether the reservation can be

Annel Action of TRIS

made for persons suffering from any of the disabilities or such reservation may be available only to a differently-abled persons suffering from The extent of one category of disability. reservation in the posts identified in terms of Equal the under Section 21 Section Opportunities Act is 3 per cent to be equally categories three amongst distributed disabilities, i.e. visual disability, hearing disability locomotor disability/cercbral However, as already pointed out, the first step is the identification of posts in the establishment which can be reserved for the persons with The State Government vide Order disabilities. 22.12.2011 dated of 2011 No.231-SW has identified the posts of Teachers, Junior (Civil) and Junior Engineer Engineer (Mechanical/Electrical), for 3 per cent reservation . under Equal Opportunities Act.

6. There is no reason why an exercise to decide whether the benefit under Section 21 of the Equal Opportunities Act is not extended to Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial) should not be

Maria Notation 1818

undertaken at an earliest. Supreme Court in "Government of India Vs. Ravi Prakash Gupta and anr." (2010) 7 SCC 626, while dealing with the case of a visually handicapped the Civil Service candidate, who qualified Examination but was denied the appointment to the service, held the petitioner to be entitled to appointment and upheld the Delhi High Court judgment, commanding the respondents to appoint him to one of the reserved posts. The petitioner claimed benefit of reservation under Disabilities Act. Sections 32 and 33 whereof are peri materia with Sections 21 and 22 of Equal Opportunities Act of 1998. The Supreme Court observed;

> "22.We have examined the matter with great care having regard to the nature of the issues involved in relation to the intention of the legislature to provide for integration of persons with disabilities into the social mainstream and to lay down a strategy for development comprehensive programmes and services and equalization of opportunities for persons with disabilities education, for their employment and rehabilitation amongst other responsibilities. We have considered the matter from the said angle to ensure that the object of the Disabilities Act, 1995, which is to give effect to the proclamation on the full participation and equality of the people with disabilities in the Asian and Pacific regions, is fulfilled."

> > Assistant Registers
> > High Court of 1416
> >
> > 2210

"25......The submission made on behalf of the Union of India regarding the implementation of the provisions of Section 33 of the Disabilities Act, 1995, only after identification of posts suitable for such appointment, under Section 32 thereof, runs counter to the legislative intent with which the Act was enacted. To accept such a submission would amount to accepting a situation where the provisions of Section 33 of the aforesaid Act could be kept deferred indefinitely by bureaucratic inaction. Such a stand taken by the petitioners before the Court was rightly Accordingly, the submission made on behalf of the Union of India that identification of Groups A and B posts in the IAS was under taken after the year 2005 is not of much

The Delhi High Court in "Ravi Prakash Gupta's" case (Supra) held the petitioner entitled to appointment though the Union of India had, in terms of Section 32 of Disability Act, yet to identify posts of Indian Administrative and Allied for reservation of differently-abled Services persons. However, the facts of the present case are different from the facts of reported case, masmuch as, in the case before Delhi High Court, the rights of the petitioner had got concretized by his successively qualifying the Civil Service Combined Examination, while in the present case, the petitioner and her similarly circumstances colleagues only aspire to compete for the posts as and when these would be available.

As decease Reported to the Court of Jack

The Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial) Recruitment Rules, 1967 made in consultation with the Public Service Commission and the High Court govern recruitment etc. to the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial). though the consultation with the Public Service Commission and the High Court may become necessary, in case, extension benefit of ofreservation under Section 21 of the Equal Opportunities Act, involves any amendment to the a first step, Social Welfare Rules, yet as Department of the State Government is to examine the claim, obtain necessary inputs from all concerned and take a decision in the matter. It is only after the department is of the opinion that the aforesaid benefit deserves to be extended to the posts under the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial), that it may have to hold consultation with the Public Service Commission Department and the High Court.

Joseph of with a direction to the Social

Welfare Department of the State Government to

High Court of JAPS

examine the matter and take a decision as regards extension of benefit under Section 21 of the Equal Opportunities Act to the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial) within three months from the date of receipt of this order. In case, the Department takes a decision in favour of the extension of benefit and identifies the posts under Service in terms of Section 21 of the Act for reservation for differently-abled persons, it shall enter into consultation with the Public Service Commission and the High Court, so that the decision is formalized within six months from the date of disposal of the present petition and differently-abled persons get the benefit of three percent reservation under Equal Opportunities Act for the posts under the Jammu and Kashmir Civil Service (Judicial) Recruitment Rules, 1967, without any further delay, in case, the decision

goes in their favour.

Solf-Honble

Solf-Honble

John 14. 3. 2012 (Harmain Massadi) M.M. Kumar

Chief Justice

No. 10669

Dt. 23-08-12

Copy of about order forwarded to the Commissioner Secretary to the Social Welfare Deportment Civil Seek (Sinages for information and necessary Compliance as directice.

· Am - D Date of Order: 04.01.2013 : Mr. Shrishti Paul Mengi, Advocate. : Mr. Gagan Basotra, Sr. AAG. Petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the Petition with Silt United (J. P. Singh) Judge 5. Showahl Pal Money Edunation

liberty to work out available remedy. Dismissed with liberty as prayed for. Jammui Sunita. 04.01.2013

SWP No. 2529/2012 MA No.3943/2012 Cavear No. 1312/2012

Appearing Counsel:

For Respondent(s)

-- For Petitioner(s)