



\$~73

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(C) 2308/2026, CM APPL. 11079/2026 and CM APPL. 11080/2026

UNION OF INDIA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shashank Dixit, CGSC
with Mr. Kumal Raj, Adv.

versus

MOLSHREE AGGARWAL & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Bajaj and Mr.
Amritesh Mishra, Advs.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KSHETARPAL

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

18.02.2026

%

1. The Central Administrative Tribunal (CAT), while disposing of Original Application (O.A.) filed by the present Respondents, has only issued directions to reconsider and re-examine the matter, while issuing the following directions:-

“(i) Having regard to the observations made in Paragraph 8, the Office Memorandum dated 20.12.2024 must be reconsidered and re-examined by the respondents.

(ii) This exercise must be undertaken in consultation with the concerned ministries governing the 19 constituent services under CSE, as well as with experts in the medical field, to identify suitable posts for persons with SLDs.

(iii) A High-Powered Committee should be constituted to carry out this exercise and ensure that the statutory mandate of reservation is fulfilled.

(iv) Any future exemption must be examined critically - whether it should apply to all 19 services or to specific ones only, and such decision must be supported by objective data and policy reasoning.

(v) The object and purpose of any exemption under clause (d) of Section 34 must be publicly disclosed, preferably as a note in the CSE 2026 advertisement.

(vi) This entire exercise must be completed prior to the issuance of the advertisement notification for CSE 2026.”



2. The O.A. before the CAT was filed by the Respondents seeking implementation of reservation for persons with disabilities strictly in terms of The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, which provides for reservation of not less than four per cent in the vacancies in Government establishments for such persons.
3. Since the Tribunal has only directed reconsideration of the matter in consultation with the concerned experts, no ground for interference is made out.
4. However, the Tribunal had directed completion of the aforesaid exercise within a period of twelve weeks. The said period has admittedly expired. In the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case, an additional period of eight weeks from today is granted to the Petitioners to complete the exercise in terms of the directions of the Tribunal.
5. In view of the aforesaid, the present Writ Petition along with pending applications, is disposed of.

ANIL KSHETARPAL, J.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J.

FEBRUARY 18, 2026/sp/ad