

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 1254 of 2026

[Salah Uddin Jiskani v. Province of Sindh and others]

Before:
Justice Arbab Ali Hakro
Justice Nisar Ahmed Bhanbhro

Petitioner by : Mr. Rahmat Ali Shaikh, holding brief for
Mr. Sikandar Sadar Siddiqui, Advocate

Respondents by : Mr. Saeed Ahmed Wassan, Assistant A.G.
Sindh

Date of Hearing : **23.09.2026**

Date of Decision : **23.09.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO, J. – The petitioner, Salahuddin Jiskani, has instituted this constitutional petition seeking directions to the respondents to appoint him against the 5% quota reserved for persons with disabilities in government departments.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a differently abled person suffering from a locomotor disability evaluated at 70%, as reflected in the Disability Assessment Certificate bearing Registration No. SPDPA/D.A.C-5725/2023 dated 11.04.2023. It is contended that the petitioner holds a Middle educational qualification and is a permanent resident/domicile holder of District Sukkur. Learned counsel states that the petitioner has repeatedly approached officials of various departments of the Government of Sindh, as well as Respondent No.3 (Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur), requesting appointment against vacant posts under the disability quota, but no favourable action has been taken on his requests to date.

3. Conversely, learned AAG Sindh, while referring to the preliminary objections filed on behalf of Respondent No.3 (Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur), submits that recruitment against the disability quota in District Sukkur has been conducted in a transparent and structured manner through the District Selection Committee (DSC). It is stated that in the DSC meetings

held during 2022-23, 2024 and 2026, approximately 100 differently abled persons were recommended and appointed to BPS-1 to BPS-4 posts across various line departments in District Sukkur. In the recruitment exercise conducted in January 2026 alone, wherein over 1,000 candidates appeared for interviews, 20 candidates were recommended for appointment. Learned AAG points out that the petitioner also appeared for interview during the January 2026 selection process, but upon comparative merit assessment by the District Selection Committee, he was not recommended for appointment.

4. We have heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned Assistant Advocate General Sindh, and perused the material available on record.

5. While the statutory framework under the Sindh Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2018 guarantees a 5% quota for persons with disabilities, such provision does not confer an automatic right to direct appointment without undergoing competitive evaluation before the competent District Selection Committee. The administrative record demonstrates that the selection process was duly carried out, and the petitioner participated in the interviews held in January 2026 alongside a large number of applicants. However, he failed to secure a merit-based recommendation from the Committee.

6. In view of the above position, no direction for immediate direct appointment can be issued in favour of the petitioner. However, the petitioner shall be at liberty to apply afresh as and when new vacancies under the 5% disability quota are advertised by the line departments in District Sukkur, subject to fulfilling all prescribed eligibility criteria under the relevant rules.

7. The instant Constitutional Petition stands **disposed of** in the above terms.

J U D G E

J U D G E