



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

205

CWP-8436-2001 (O&M)

Date of decision: 01.12.2025

Satinder Pal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

The Union of India and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAMIT KUMAR

Present : None for the petitioner.

Mr. S.K. Sharma, Sr. Panel Counsel with
Mr. Rajat Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.1-UOI.

Mr. Surya Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

NAMIT KUMAR, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India, seeking a writ of mandamus, directing the respondents to prepare a comprehensive scheme regarding the petitioner's category i.e. blind [including partially blind (low vision) and one eyed person] in view of various pleas/grounds taken in the present petition and representation/legal notices sent by the petitioner.

2. Learned State counsel, while referring to the averments made in para 3 of the preliminary submissions of written statement, submits that the petitioner has been issued a disability certificate confirming his disability only 30% and the persons with 40% disability are entitled to get various benefits extended to the persons with

disability. He does not fall in the category of persons with disability, hence, he is not entitled to get the benefit as minimum degree of disability required is 40% in order to be eligible for any concession/benefits.

3. Para 3 of the preliminary submissions of the written statement reads as under:-

“3. That the petitioner is a one eyed person. He has been issued disability certificate confirming his disability only 30%. The persons with forty percent disability are entitled to get the various benefits extended to the persons with disability. He does not fall in the category of persons with disability, hence he is not entitled to get any benefit as minimum degree of disability should be 40% in order to be eligible for any concession/benefits. The guidelines issued by the Government of India, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment are based on the recommendations made by the Sub Committee constituted in the area of Mental Retardation, Orthopaedic/ locomotor disability, Visual Disability, Speech and Hearing and Multiple Disabilities under the Chairmanship of Dr. S.P. Aggarwal, Director General of Health Services, Govt. of India. There is no justification/no logic to upgrade the percentage of disability from 30% to 40% or to carry out any amendment in the Act as such situation would deprive the deserved disabled from getting the benefit reservation in Government employment. Statement Government has provided employment to 4159 disabled persons in State Services and 525 disabled have got employment in private sector. As per survey report 55110 persons (ANNEKURE-R-1) with 40% or more disability are available in the State for getting the benefit of reservation. It is also submitted that about 18000 disabled persons have got themselves registered with the Special Employment Exchange, Ludhiana for Government/Private Employment.”

4. Learned State counsel further submits that in view of the above, the petitioner is not entitled for the relief claimed in the present petition.

5. As per office report, Mr. Deepak Agnihotri, Advocate, counsel for the petitioner, has been informed about the date of hearing

in the present case, however, none is present on behalf of the petitioner.

6. In view of the statement made by learned State counsel, the present petition is disposed of. However, liberty is granted to the petitioner to revive the present petition in case he is aggrieved against the present order.

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

01.12.2025

Vinay

(NAMIT KUMAR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No