

**Mohit Garg      Vs.    Union of India and others**

Present:    Mr. Karan Nehra, Advocate and  
              Mr. Shiv Charan Bhola, Advocate and  
              Mr. Mohit Garg, Advocate  
              for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Pankaj Gupta, Senior Panel Counsel  
for respondents No.1 and 2-UOI (in CWP-8048-2018).

Ms. Amrita Garg, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjeev Kaushik, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

\*\*\*\*\*

Learned counsel appearing for the State of Haryana wants time to get instructions from the State Government as to whether the State is ready to provide reservation to the disabled category in terms of the Act of 2016 which has been duly adopted and the Rules have been framed.

It has also been brought to our notice by the counsel appearing for the petitioner that the office of Advocate General has been identified as one of the offices where a particular category with certain benchmark of disability has also been earmarked for providing the necessary reservation.

We noticed that while State of Punjab has provided reservation to SC/BC category candidates for appointment as Law Officers, the advertisement issued by the office of Advocate General, Haryana for appointing Law Officers in the State of Haryana has not provided any kind of reservation to any category. Instructions in this regard may be taken and this Court may be informed as to why reservation ought not been directed to be provided to the extent of 4% as per the Scheme of the Act to the disabled category earmarked for Advocate General office on coming selections for

**CWP-8048-2018 (O&M)**  
**CWP-13281-2022 (O&M)**  
**CWP-10638-2020 (O&M)**

**-2-**

the post of Law Officers in the State of Haryana too and responsible official's affidavit be filed in this regard before the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 20.02.2025.

A photocopy of this order be placed on the files of other connected cases.

**(SANJEEV PRAKASH SHARMA)**  
**JUDGE**

**06.02.2025**  
D.Bansal

**(MEENAKSHI I. MEHTA)**  
**JUDGE**