



\$~100

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

+ **W.P.(C) 2002/2026**

Date of Decision: **12.02.2026**

IN THE MATTER OF:

ANIL KUMAR SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Tarveen Singh Nanda, Advocate,
DHCLSC with Petitioner in person.**

versus

UNION OF INDIA AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Abhinav Singh, Advocate for
UOI.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

J U D G E M E N T

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J. (ORAL)

**CM APPL. 9754/2026 (EXEMPTION) and CM APPL. 9755/2026
(PERMISSION TO ALLOW FILING OF THE SYNOPSIS)**

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(C) 2002/2026 and CM APPL. 9753/2026

3. The petition is for following reliefs :

a. Issue a writ of Mandamus or any other appropriate writ, order or direction directing the Respondent No.1 to ensure implementation, compliance and enforcement of the Order dated 27.09.2019 passed by the Hon'ble Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities in Case No. 9624/1023/2018, within a time-bound period;



b. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents No.2 and 3 to file a detailed and reasoned compliance report before this Hon 'ble Court, strictly in terms of the Order dated 27.09.2019, as directed by the Hon'ble Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities;

c. Issue a writ of Mandamus directing the Respondents No.2 and 3 to consider the reinstatement of the Petitioner to the same or an equivalent post, with reasonable accommodation, strictly in accordance with the Order dated 27.09.2019 and the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016; ~

OR ALTERNATIVELY

d. Direct the Respondent No.I to consider and decide, in accordance with law, the Petitioner's claim for appropriate compensation, on account of the prolonged and deliberate non-compliance of the Order dated 27.09.2019 by the Respondents No.2 and 3, in the event reinstatement is found not feasible for legally sustainable reasons;

e. Direct that the entire exercise of compliance, consideration and reporting be completed within a period of eight weeks from the date of receipt of the order passed by this Hon 'ble Court;

f. Pass such other or further order(s) as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the facts and circumstances of the present case, in the interest of justice.

4. The Petitioner is a person with benchmark disability and was employed with Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, namely United Health Group Information Services Pvt. Ltd. and Optum Global Solutions Pvt. Ltd..

5. It is the case of the petitioner, that during the course of his employment, the petitioner was subjected to adverse and discriminatory treatment, including imposition of unrealistic performance targets and coercive corrective action measures despite disclosure of his disability, ultimately resulting in his forced resignation on 18.12.2017.

6. Aggrieved thereby, the petitioner filed a complaint before the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Upon consideration of the complaint and after hearing the parties, the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, vide Order dated 27.09.2019 passed in Case No. 9624/1023/2018, directed



respondent No.3 to consider reinstatement of the petitioner and to submit a compliance report within the stipulated period. However, despite the said order attaining finality, the respondents failed to comply with the directions or submit any compliance report. Petitioner submits that several representations seeking implementation of the aforesaid order has been made, however, no action was taken by the respondents.

7. It appears that the solitary grievance raised by the petitioner relates to non-compliance of the order dated 27.09.2019 passed by the Chief Commissioner under the provisions of Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

8. The order dated 27.09.2019 would reveal that the Chief Commissioner directed respondent no.3 to reinstate the petitioner. The petitioner seems to have made various complaints regarding non-implementation of the said directions. Those complaints do not seem to have been considered by the said Authority.

9. Let the petitioner to approach the concerned Chief Commissioner, who in turn shall ensure that his directions are fully implemented by the concerned Authority with due expedition. Let the necessary orders be passed by the Chief Commissioner within a period of 45 days from the date of receipt of the copy of the order passed today. If thereafter, the petitioner's grievance is not mitigated, the petitioner shall be at liberty to take appropriate recourse in accordance with law.

10. With the aforesaid, the petition, along with pending application(s) stands disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

FEBRUARY 12, 2026/aks/amg.