2026:AHC:227130

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 18062 of 2026

Brajesh Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

Union Of India And 4 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Kumar Ashutosh Srivastava, Nagendra Pratap Singh
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	A.S.G.I., C.S.C., Shiv Kumar Pal, Siddharth Singhal

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE MANISH KUMAR NIGAM, J.

1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Shri Abhishek Vishwakarma, Advocate holding brief of Shri Shiv Kumar Pal, learned Deputy Solicitor General of India for respondent no. 1, learned Standing Counsel for the State-respondents and perused the record.

2. This petition has been filed for the following relief:

> *"a) a writ, order or direction in the nature of certiorari quashing the Government Order dated 30.07.2021 (Annexure No. 7 to this writ petition) in so far as it excludes all locomotor disability from consideration for the post of Lekhpal.*
>
> *(b) a writ, order or direction of suitable nature commanding the respondent No. 4 for conduct document verification of physically handicapped candidates who have secured merit position of their own merit in the vertical categories of Unreserved/Other Backward Class/ Schedule Caste without requiring them confirm to the requirement of the Government Order dated 30.07.2021 Issued by the State Government.*
>
> *c) a writ, order or direction of suitable nature commanding the respondents to adjudge the physical disability of the candidates selected under reserved sub-category of physically handicapped on the basis of the identification parameters specified under the Government Order issued by the Central Government dated 04.01.2021."*

3. Contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that candidature of the petitioner has been rejected for the post of Lekhpal as the petitioner was having locomotor disability which is not covered under the Government Order dated 30.07.2021. It has been further submitted that later on by another Government Order dated 30.09.2024, locomotor disability has been covered and this question has been considered by the Division Bench of this Court in case of **Neetu Kumar and 21 others v. Union of India and 4 others, passed in Writ A No. 18445 of 2023**, decided on 01.09.2026, wherein, this Court has directed as follows:

> *"In the circumstances we direct that in event vacant posts exist to fulfill 1% of aggregate 8085 posts then, those of petitioners who were found eligible are to be given appointment by way of reasonable accommodation. Otherwise, supernumerary posts are to be created for such accommodation. Petitioners will communicate certified copy of this order to respondent no. 4, who we are told is the appointing authority. There be compliance within six weeks thereafter."*

4. Shri Siddharth Singhal, learned counsel for the respondent though opposed the writ petition but could not deny that this Court in case of **Neetu Kumar and others** (Supra) has directed for consideration and the said order has yet not been challenged before the Supreme Court.

5. In view of these facts, this writ petition stands **disposed of** in terms of judgment passed in case of **Neetu Kumar and others** (Supra) and the respondents are directed to act accordingly.

(Manish Kumar Nigam,J.)

November 2, 2026
Ved Prakash

Digitally signed by :-
VED PRAKASH SHARMA
High Court of Judicature at Allahabad