

THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH BENCH AT SUKKUR

C. P. No. D – 903 of 2026

[Muhammad Nawaz v. Province of Sindh and others]

Before:
Justice Arbab Ali Hakro
Justice Muhammad Osman Ali Hadi

Petitioner by : Mr. Babar Khan Sahito, Advocate

Respondents by : Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Naich, Assistant Advocate
General Sindh

Date of Hearing : **09.09.2026**

Date of Decision : **09.09.2026**

ORDER

ARBAB ALI HAKRO, J. – The petitioner has invoked the constitutional jurisdiction of this Court, seeking his consideration for appointment under the 5% quota reserved for persons with disabilities.

2. The petitioner claims to be a person with a physical disability (Locomotor Disability) to the extent of 70% and possesses a Disability Certificate bearing Registration No. SPDPA/D.A.C-3792/2024, issued on 27.03.2024 by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Government of Sindh. He states that he is a permanent resident of District Sukkur and holds Domicile and PRC. It is his case that he approached the concerned authorities for appointment against the disability quota and submitted an application, along with his testimonials, Domicile and PRC, seeking appointment to a suitable post. The said application is on record.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that, despite the petitioner’s eligibility and submission of an application for appointment under the disability quota, he was not considered for appointment. He therefore seeks a direction to the respondents to consider his candidature and appoint him to any suitable post in accordance with law.

4. Learned AAG Sindh, while referring to the comments/report submitted by the Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur, submits that the recruitment process

under the 5% quota for persons with disabilities was conducted by the District Selection Committee. It is stated that twenty (20) appointments were made at a meeting held in January 2026, at which more than 1000 applicants appeared for interviews. The petitioner also appeared for the interview; however, upon consideration of the eligible candidates, he was not recommended for appointment by the District Selection Committee.

5. We have heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned AAG Sindh, and have perused the averments in the petition, the documents on record, and the comments/report submitted by the respondents.

6. The record shows that the petitioner submitted an application for appointment under the disability quota and subsequently participated in the recruitment process conducted by the District Selection Committee in January 2026. The Committee considered candidates against the available vacancies, and twenty (20) appointments were made under the said quota. Although the petitioner appeared for the interview, he was not recommended for appointment. There is nothing on record to show that his application was left unconsidered or that he was excluded from the selection process.

7. It is an essential requirement for appointment to any government or public post that a candidate must satisfy the prescribed legal and codal requirements and undergo the recruitment process initiated by the competent authority. The submission of an application and participation in the selection process do not, by themselves, confer an automatic right to appointment. Selection for available vacancies depends on eligibility, merit and the recommendation of the competent selection authority.

8. The reservation of a quota for persons with disabilities constitutes a statutory safeguard intended to secure their representation in government employment. However, such reservation does not dispense with the prescribed recruitment process or create an unconditional right to appointment in favour of every eligible person with a disability. The benefit of the reserved quota is to be extended through a fair, transparent and lawful selection process.

9. The Sindh Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2018, being beneficial legislation, provides for a 5% quota for persons with disabilities in

Government departments, institutions and entities. The statutory protection is required to be implemented in its true spirit; nevertheless, appointments against the reserved quota remain subject to the prescribed eligibility, selection and other legal requirements. Thus, entitlement to consideration under the quota cannot be equated with an automatic entitlement to appointment.

10. In the present case, the respondents have specifically stated that the petitioner participated in the interview conducted by the District Selection Committee in January 2026 but was not recommended for appointment. The available record does not disclose any material indicating that his application was ignored or that the selection process was arbitrary or discriminatory. The fact that the petitioner possessed the requisite disability certificate and had submitted an application could, at most, entitle him to consideration, which, according to the record, was afforded to him.

11. In these circumstances, no direction can be issued for the direct appointment of the petitioner. However, the petitioner shall remain at liberty to participate in any subsequent recruitment process conducted by the competent authority under the 5% quota reserved for persons with disabilities. His candidature, if otherwise eligible, shall be considered in accordance with the law, merit and the prescribed recruitment procedure.

12. Accordingly, the instant Constitutional Petition is **disposed of** in the above terms.

J U D G E

J U D G E

Abdul Basit