

Delhi High Court

Pratap Singh Bist & Anr vs University Of Delhi & Anr. on 14 March, 2012

Author: Rajiv Sahai Endlaw

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

Date of decision: 14th March, 2012

+ W.P.(C) No.1801/2008

% PRATAP SINGH BIST & ANR. ....Petitioners  
Through: Mr. Rajan Mani, Adv.

Versus

UNIVERSITY OF DELHI & ANR. .... Respondents  
Through: Ms. Maninder Acharya & Mr.  
Yashish Chandra, Advs. for R-1.  
Mr. Amitesh Kumar & Mr. Ravi  
Kant, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM :-

HON'BLE THE ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW

JUDGMENT

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J.

1. This petition was filed in Public Interest drawing the attention of this Court to non observance / non compliance by the respondent No.1 University of Delhi with the provisions of Section 33 of the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995 in respect of the non teaching staff of Delhi University. Notice of the petition was issued and directions issued from time to time. The respondent No.1 University of Delhi, as recorded in the order dated 12.02.2009, filed an affidavit indicating the steps taken to fill up the 3% quota posts reserved for persons with disability in the non-teaching staff and further assured that vacancies will be filled up as indicated in the affidavit. Though University Grants Commission was also impleaded as respondent No.2 but in view of the order of the Supreme Court in W.P.(C) No.115/1998 titled All India Confederation of the Blind Vs. UOI and as recorded in the order dated 12.02.2009 in these proceedings, the relief qua the UGC stood satisfied.

2. The respondent No.1 University of Delhi has in compliance with the directions in these proceedings from time to time commenced reserving the posts in accordance with Section 33 (supra) and filed status report before this Court from time to time. Vide order dated 13.08.2010 in these proceedings with the consent of the counsel for the University, Mr. Rajan Mani, Advocate for the petitioners was allowed to make certain suggestions to the respondent No.1 University of Delhi. Pursuant thereto certain other posts which could be reserved for the persons with disability were identified and the Selection Committee has made recommendations for appointment.

3. We are satisfied that this petition filed as Public Interest Litigation has served its purpose and the respondent No.1 University of Delhi has made arrangements for complying with Section 33 of the

Disability Act.

No further orders are deemed necessary.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

RAJIV SAHAI ENDLAW, J ACTING CHIEF JUSTICE MARCH 14, 2012/'gsr'