



\$~160

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ W.P.(C) 13312/2024 and CM APPL. 55603/2024-55608/2024

SAURABH DIKSHITPetitioner

Through: Petitioner in person.

versus

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Rajesh Kumar Agnihotri,
Advocate for Respondents No.1 and 3/GNCTD.

Mr. Vasuchit Anand, Government Pleader for
Respondent No.2/UOI.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

% **23.09.2024**

1. This writ petition has been preferred by the Petitioner under Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking multiple reliefs which are: direction to Delhi State Commissioner of Persons with Disabilities to pass an order against Wipro Ltd. to provide information with respect to handling of matter pertaining to Petitioner's termination; for reinstatement of the Petitioner with back wages, arrears of pay, etc.; compensation to the tune of Rs.2,31,73,760/- to the Petitioner; declaration that Labour Commissioner, State and Central Disability Commissioners, EPFO Commissioner and SEBI have failed to follow due process causing irreparable damage to the Petitioner; declaring the Delhi and Central Government liable for connivance in Wipro's unlawful action; compensation of Rs.1 crore from Central Government for discrimination faced by the Petitioner under current legal framework of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016; grant



of monthly pension from 2018 onwards; direction to the Delhi Government to secure a plot of land for the Petitioner in a Delhi Village for construction of his home; direction to include Labour Courts on e-Court platforms to ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities; establishment of a fast track Court to examine the civil wrong by Wipro against the Petitioner; departmental investigation into the conduct of Disability Commissioner regarding the handling of Petitioner's case; waiver of Court fees for persons with disabilities; including Court Registrars and Legal Service Authorities under Central Public Grievance Portal for persons with disabilities; granting reasonable adjustments concerning requirements for notarization of affidavits in judicial proceedings for persons with severe disabilities; direction to the Delhi Government to provide health insurance coverage of Rs.5 lacs per annum to the Petitioner for lifetime; applying Section 20 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 to employees in private sectors; and declaring that Limitation Act, 1963 will be inapplicable to persons with disabilities.

2. On a reading of the writ petition, it is evident that a number of unrelated issues have been raised in the present petition and there is misjoinder of causes of action. Petitioner, who appears in person, seeks to withdraw this writ petition with liberty to file separate writ petitions for different causes of actions before the appropriate Courts. He further submits that he does not have the financial capacity to litigate and legal aid is being denied to him despite repeated efforts to seek appointment of a Legal Aid Counsel.

3. This writ petition is accordingly disposed of as withdrawn, with liberty to the Petitioner to file a fresh writ petition restricting the reliefs to



service matter related issues and in respect of remaining reliefs, Petitioner may take recourse to separate remedies. Member Secretary, Delhi High Court Legal Services Authority is requested to examine the request of the Petitioner for engaging a Legal Aid Counsel in case he approaches the Authority. Pending applications stand disposed of.

4. Copy of the order be sent to the Member Secretary, Delhi High Court Legal Services Authority.

JYOTI SINGH, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2024

B.S. Rohella