



INTERNATIONAL LAW
JOURNAL

**WHITE BLACK
LEGAL LAW
JOURNAL
ISSN: 2581-
8503**

Peer - Reviewed & Refereed Journal

The Law Journal strives to provide a platform for discussion of International as well as National Developments in the Field of Law.

WWW.WHITEBLACKLEGAL.CO.IN

DISCLAIMER

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted, translated, or distributed in any form or by any means—whether electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, scanning, or otherwise—without the prior written permission of the Editor-in-Chief of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*.

All copyrights in the articles published in this journal vest with *White Black Legal – The Law Journal*, unless otherwise expressly stated. Authors are solely responsible for the originality, authenticity, accuracy, and legality of the content submitted and published.

The views, opinions, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in the articles are exclusively those of the respective authors. They do not represent or reflect the views of the Editorial Board, Editors, Reviewers, Advisors, Publisher, or Management of *White Black Legal*.

While reasonable efforts are made to ensure academic quality and accuracy through editorial and peer-review processes, *White Black Legal* makes no representations or warranties, express or implied, regarding the completeness, accuracy, reliability, or suitability of the content published. The journal shall not be liable for any errors, omissions, inaccuracies, or consequences arising from the use, interpretation, or reliance upon the information contained in this publication.

The content published in this journal is intended solely for academic and informational purposes and shall not be construed as legal advice, professional advice, or legal opinion. *White Black Legal* expressly disclaims all liability for any loss, damage, claim, or legal consequence arising directly or indirectly from the use of any material published herein.

ABOUT WHITE BLACK LEGAL

White Black Legal – The Law Journal is an open-access, peer-reviewed, and refereed legal journal established to provide a scholarly platform for the examination and discussion of contemporary legal issues. The journal is dedicated to encouraging rigorous legal research, critical analysis, and informed academic discourse across diverse fields of law.

The journal invites contributions from law students, researchers, academicians, legal practitioners, and policy scholars. By facilitating engagement between emerging scholars and experienced legal professionals, *White Black Legal* seeks to bridge theoretical legal research with practical, institutional, and societal perspectives.

In a rapidly evolving social, economic, and technological environment, the journal endeavours to examine the changing role of law and its impact on governance, justice systems, and society. *White Black Legal* remains committed to academic integrity, ethical research practices, and the dissemination of accessible legal scholarship to a global readership.

AIM & SCOPE

The aim of *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* is to promote excellence in legal research and to provide a credible academic forum for the analysis, discussion, and advancement of contemporary legal issues. The journal encourages original, analytical, and well-researched contributions that add substantive value to legal scholarship.

The journal publishes scholarly works examining doctrinal, theoretical, empirical, and interdisciplinary perspectives of law. Submissions are welcomed from academicians, legal professionals, researchers, scholars, and students who demonstrate intellectual rigour, analytical clarity, and relevance to current legal and policy developments.

The scope of the journal includes, but is not limited to:

- Constitutional and Administrative Law
- Criminal Law and Criminal Justice
- Corporate, Commercial, and Business Laws
- Intellectual Property and Technology Law
- International Law and Human Rights
- Environmental and Sustainable Development Law
- Cyber Law, Artificial Intelligence, and Emerging Technologies
- Family Law, Labour Law, and Social Justice Studies

The journal accepts original research articles, case comments, legislative and policy analyses, book reviews, and interdisciplinary studies addressing legal issues at national and international levels. All submissions are subject to a rigorous double-blind peer-review process to ensure academic quality, originality, and relevance.

Through its publications, *White Black Legal – The Law Journal* seeks to foster critical legal thinking and contribute to the development of law as an instrument of justice, governance, and social progress, while expressly disclaiming responsibility for the application or misuse of published content.

EMPLOYMENT RIGHTS OF PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES IN INDIA: A CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF LEGAL SAFEGUARDS

AUTHORED BY - DEEPAK CHAHAL
Punjabi University, Patiala

Abstract

Persons with disabilities (PwDs) in India constitute approximately 2.21% of the total population as per the 2011 Census, though activist organizations and international bodies estimate the actual figure to be significantly higher. Despite constitutional guarantees of equality and the enactment of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPWD Act), which replaced the Persons with Disabilities (Equal Opportunities, Protection of Rights and Full Participation) Act, 1995, PwDs continue to face pervasive discrimination in employment, barriers to workplace participation, and inadequate enforcement of legal safeguards. This paper undertakes a critical analysis of the legal framework governing employment rights of persons with disabilities in India, focusing on the RPWD Act, 2016, reservation policies in public employment, anti-discrimination provisions, reasonable accommodation obligations, and enforcement mechanisms. The paper examines the gap between the formal legal framework and the lived employment realities of PwDs, drawing on empirical studies, government data, and judicial pronouncements. A comparative analysis with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the UK Equality Act 2010, and the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) illuminates areas where the Indian framework falls short. The paper concludes that while the RPWD Act, 2016 represents a significant advance over its predecessor and aligns India more closely with the CRPD framework, critical deficiencies remain particularly regarding private sector obligations, the definition of reasonable accommodation, enforcement mechanisms, and the treatment of multiple and intersectional disabilities. Concrete recommendations for legal and policy reform are presented.

Keywords: disability rights, employment, reasonable accommodation, RPWD Act 2016, reservation, anti-discrimination, CRPD, India, persons with disabilities, workplace inclusion

1. Introduction

The right to work and to earn a livelihood is central to human dignity, economic independence, and social inclusion. For persons with disabilities in India, this right has historically been more aspiration than reality. Social stigma, physical inaccessibility of workplaces, low educational attainment attributable to barriers in the school system, employer prejudice, and the near-total absence of reasonable accommodation in the workplace have combined to produce chronic unemployment and underemployment among PwDs. The National Sample Survey (2018) found that the labour force participation rate for PwDs was significantly lower than the national average, and that a disproportionate proportion of employed PwDs were engaged in informal, low-wage work without any social security protection.

India ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) in October 2007, committing to recognize the right of persons with disabilities to work, on an equal basis with others, including the right to the opportunity to gain a living by work freely chosen or accepted in a labour market and work environment that is open, inclusive, and accessible. The domestic legislative response to this commitment came in the form of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, which superseded the Persons with Disabilities Act, 1995 and sought to align the Indian legal framework with the CRPD.

However, the enactment of progressive legislation is a necessary but not sufficient condition for the realization of employment rights. The challenges of implementation, enforcement, and attitudinal change remain formidable. This paper critically examines whether the legal framework created by the RPWD Act, 2016 combined with constitutional provisions and other relevant legislation is adequate to ensure meaningful employment rights for PwDs, or whether structural gaps and implementation deficits undermine its effectiveness.

The paper proceeds as follows: Section 2 outlines the methodology. Section 3 sets out the research objectives and questions. Section 4 surveys the relevant literature. Section 5 constitutes the main analytical body of the paper. Section 6 presents conclusions and recommendations.

2. Methodology

This research employs a combined doctrinal and comparative legal methodology. The doctrinal analysis examines the text and judicial interpretation of the Constitution of India, the RPWD Act, 2016, the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Rules, 2017, and other relevant legislation including the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, and sector-specific legislation. Judicial decisions of the Supreme Court of India and High Courts on disability rights in employment are analyzed systematically.

The comparative dimension draws on the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and its 2008 Amendments, and the Equality Act 2010 of the United Kingdom. These comparators are chosen because they represent the most developed national and international legal frameworks for disability rights in employment, and they provide a standard against which the Indian framework can be evaluated.

The analysis is supplemented by reference to empirical data from the National Sample Survey on Disability (2018), the Periodic Labour Force Survey, reports of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, and studies conducted by civil society organizations. Statistical data on employment rates, reservation filling, and workplace accommodation are used to bridge the gap between formal law and empirical reality.

3. Research Objectives and Questions

3.1 Objectives

The objectives of this research are: (i) to critically analyze the legal framework governing employment rights of PwDs under the RPWD Act, 2016 and allied legislation; (ii) to examine the effectiveness of reservation policies in public employment; (iii) to evaluate the concept and implementation of reasonable accommodation in the Indian context; (iv) to assess anti-discrimination provisions and enforcement mechanisms; (v) to compare the Indian framework with international best practices; and (vi) to formulate recommendations for legal and policy reform.

3.2 Research Questions

1. Does the RPWD Act, 2016 adequately protect the employment rights of PwDs in India,

- including in the private sector?
2. How effective are reservation policies in ensuring the employment of PwDs in government positions?
 3. Does the concept of reasonable accommodation under the RPWD Act, 2016 meet the standards established by the CRPD?
 4. What are the principal enforcement gaps in the existing legal framework, and how can they be addressed?

4. Literature Review

The scholarly literature on disability rights and employment in India spans legal scholarship, sociological research, and development studies. This section reviews the principal contributions to the field.

Mehrotra (2011) provided one of the earliest comprehensive analyses of the Persons with Disabilities Act, 1995, documenting the Act's limited impact on employment outcomes for PwDs. Mehrotra found that reservation quotas in government employment were systematically unfilled, that no-discrimination provisions were unenforceable in practice, and that the PwD Act's silence on the private sector meant that the vast majority of the Indian workforce was entirely unregulated. Mehrotra's study established the template for subsequent critiques of the formal-substantive gap in disability rights legislation (Mehrotra, 2011, pp. 34-38).

Anupama (2013) examined the socio-legal barriers to employment for persons with intellectual disabilities, a group that had been largely ignored in both legal and sociological scholarship. Anupama found that employers were particularly reluctant to hire persons with intellectual disabilities, citing concerns about productivity and liability, and that no public support mechanisms existed to assist such employers. This study highlighted the inadequacy of a purely anti-discrimination approach in addressing the employment barriers faced by persons with more severe or complex disabilities (Anupama, 2013, pp. 89-94).

Samant and Bhambhani (2015) conducted a large-scale study of employment patterns among PwDs in five Indian cities, finding that despite formal educational qualifications, PwDs were concentrated in low-skill, low-wage occupations. They attributed this to employer

prejudice, the inaccessibility of physical workplaces, and the absence of assistive technology in public sector offices. Their finding that persons with multiple disabilities experienced unemployment rates nearly three times higher than those with single disabilities highlighted the importance of addressing intersectionality within the disability framework (Samant & Bhambhani, 2015, p. 112).

The enactment of the RPWD Act, 2016 generated substantial scholarly commentary. Bhatt and Singh (2017) undertook an early comparative analysis of the 1995 and 2016 Acts, finding that while the 2016 Act substantially expanded the categories of disability recognized, strengthened reservations in government employment, and introduced the concept of reasonable accommodation, it fell short of full CRPD compliance in several key areas, including its weak reasonable accommodation definition and its failure to impose meaningful obligations on the private sector (Bhatt & Singh, 2017, pp. 45-52).

Mehta (2018) analyzed the judicial interpretation of disability rights in the employment context, finding that Indian courts had adopted an increasingly rights-based approach in post-CRPD decisions but that inconsistency in judicial reasoning created uncertainty. Mehta observed that courts had begun to import the reasonable accommodation concept from international law even before its statutory codification in the 2016 Act, but that the scope and content of the obligation remained ill-defined (Mehta, 2018, pp. 201-207).

The comparative dimension of disability employment rights has been analyzed by several scholars. Waddington and Hendriks (2002) undertook a comparative study of disability anti-discrimination legislation in Europe and North America, finding that the concept of reasonable accommodation requiring employers to make individualized adjustments for disabled workers was the most effective tool for integrating PwDs into the workforce, provided it was coupled with robust enforcement mechanisms. Their work has been influential in the development of Indian scholarship on the subject (Waddington & Hendriks, 2002, p. 404).

Oliver (2013) offered a critical disability studies perspective on legal frameworks for employment, arguing that medical models of disability which focus on individual impairment must give way to social models that recognize disability as a product of social and environmental barriers rather than individual deficit. Oliver contended that employment legislation premised on the medical model will inevitably be insufficient because it locates the

problem in the disabled person rather than in the disabling environment (Oliver, 2013, pp. 15-18).

Davar (2019) examined the intersection of mental health disability and employment rights in India, a domain that has received insufficient scholarly attention. Davar documented the pervasive stigma attached to mental illness in the Indian workplace, the lack of reasonable accommodation provisions specifically addressing mental health disabilities, and the adverse impact of the legal regime's residual focus on physical disability (Davar, 2019, pp. 78-82).

Sharma and Gupta (2021) analyzed the implementation of RPWD Act provisions through Right to Information (RTI) queries filed with government departments, finding widespread non-compliance with statutory requirements regarding accessibility, reservation filling, and the appointment of Chief Commissioners of Persons with Disabilities at the state level. Their empirical study provided quantitative evidence for the implementation deficit that qualitative scholars had documented (Sharma & Gupta, 2021, pp. 34-41).

5. Analysis

5.1 Constitutional Framework

The constitutional foundations of employment rights for PwDs in India are found in the Directive Principles of State Policy and the fundamental rights provisions of the Constitution. Article 41 directs the State to make effective provision for securing the right to work, education, and public assistance in cases of disablement. Article 46 directs the State to promote the educational and economic interests of weaker sections. While these provisions are non-justiciable, the Supreme Court has progressively held that they must inform the interpretation of fundamental rights, particularly the right to life under Article 21.

The right to equality under Article 14, the prohibition of discrimination under Article 15, and the guarantee of equality of opportunity in public employment under Article 16 form the core constitutional basis for employment rights of PwDs. In *Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India* (2016), the Supreme Court held that discrimination against persons with disabilities constitutes discrimination on grounds of disability within the meaning of the equality provisions, and that the State is obligated to take affirmative steps to ensure substantive equality.

The CRPD, ratified by India in 2007, has been recognized by Indian courts as part of the domestic legal framework through the doctrine of incorporation by reference. In *National*

Federation of the Blind v. Union Public Service Commission (1993), the Supreme Court held that PwDs have a fundamental right to be considered for employment, and that the failure of the State to make reasonable accommodation constitutes a violation of the right to equality.

5.2 The RPWD Act, 2016: Key Provisions on Employment

The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 represents the most comprehensive statutory framework for disability rights in India's legislative history. The Act recognizes twenty-one categories of disability, a significant expansion from the seven categories under the 1995 Act, reflecting developments in the understanding of disability and the specific vulnerabilities of persons with different types of disabilities.

Chapter V of the RPWD Act, 2016, comprising Sections 20-24, constitutes the core employment provisions. Section 20 places non-discrimination obligations on government establishments, requiring them not to discriminate against PwDs in matters relating to employment, promotion, or transfer. Section 20(1) specifically mandates that no government establishment shall discriminate against any person with disability on grounds of disability in any matter relating to employment. However, the scope of this non-discrimination obligation is limited to government establishments, leaving the private sector substantially unregulated.

Section 21 requires every government establishment to notify equal opportunity policies and maintain records on the employment of PwDs. Section 22 mandates the appointment of a Liaison Officer in each government establishment to oversee the recruitment of PwDs and the provision of facilities. These provisions are positive but their efficacy depends entirely on the seriousness with which establishments approach their statutory obligations.

The reservation provisions under Section 34 are the Act's most significant employment-related contribution. The Act mandates a reservation of not less than four percent of the total number of vacancies in government establishments for persons with benchmark disabilities. This represents an increase from the three percent reservation under the 1995 Act and a broadening of the category of beneficiaries. Benchmark disability is defined as at least forty percent disability as certified by a specified authority.

5.3 Reasonable Accommodation: Law and Practice

Section 2(y) of the RPWD Act, 2016 defines 'reasonable accommodation' as 'necessary and appropriate modification and adjustments, without imposing a disproportionate or undue burden in a particular case, to ensure to persons with disabilities the enjoyment or exercise of rights equally with others.' This definition is drawn directly from Article 2 of the CRPD and

represents the first statutory recognition of the reasonable accommodation concept in Indian law.

Section 20(4) of the Act imposes a specific obligation on government establishments to make reasonable accommodation for PwDs. The obligation is qualified by the 'undue burden' test an employer is not required to make accommodations that impose a disproportionate burden, having regard to available resources and other relevant factors. However, the Act does not specify the factors to be considered in the undue burden assessment, creating significant uncertainty in practice.

The absence of reasonable accommodation obligations in the private sector is a critical deficiency. The private sector employs the vast majority of formally employed workers in India, and the failure to extend reasonable accommodation obligations to private employers means that PwDs seeking employment in the private sector have no statutory recourse when employers refuse to make necessary adjustments. While Section 3 imposes general anti-discrimination obligations on 'appropriate governments' and 'establishments,' the specific reasonable accommodation mandate under Section 20 is explicitly limited to government establishments.

In practice, even in government establishments, the implementation of reasonable accommodation has been limited. A study by the National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People (2019) found that few government departments had formal reasonable accommodation policies, that informal accommodation was granted inconsistently and on the basis of the discretion of individual supervisors rather than systematic assessment, and that awareness among PwD employees of their right to seek accommodation was extremely low.

5.4 Reservation Policy: Efficacy and Challenges

The reservation of four percent of vacancies in government establishments for PwDs is the central mechanism for their employment integration in the public sector. The implementation of this reservation has been deeply problematic. Annual reports of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities consistently document significant shortfalls in the filling of reserved vacancies across central government ministries and departments.

The 2019 Annual Report of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities revealed that a substantial proportion of reserved vacancies across Groups A, B, C, and D government posts remained unfilled. The causes of under-filling include the failure of

recruiting bodies to advertise vacancies specifically for PwDs, the application of fitness standards that disqualify PwDs from positions that they could perform with reasonable accommodation, bureaucratic delays in the certification of disability, and the concentration of PwDs in lower-grade posts.

The Supreme Court in *Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission* (2021) addressed the obligation of the UPSC to make reasonable accommodation for persons with benchmark disabilities appearing in competitive examinations. The Court held that the refusal to provide a scribe to a person with a writing disability constituted a violation of the RPWD Act, 2016 and the constitutional right to equality. This judgment is significant not only for its result but for its affirmation that the reasonable accommodation obligation extends to the recruitment process and not merely to employment conditions.

5.5 Private Sector: The Missing Dimension

The RPWD Act, 2016's regulatory approach to the private sector is markedly weaker than its approach to government establishments. Section 3 prohibits discrimination by 'every person' on grounds of disability, and Section 2(k) defines 'establishment' to include both government and private sector entities. However, the specific employment protections reservation, Liaison Officers, equal opportunity policies, and reasonable accommodation obligations are expressly limited to government establishments.

The only private-sector-specific employment provision in the Act is Section 20(2), which encourages appropriate governments to provide incentives to private sector establishments to comply with the non-discrimination mandate. This purely incentive-based approach to private sector disability employment has been widely criticized as inadequate. The ADA, by contrast, imposes mandatory anti-discrimination and reasonable accommodation obligations on private employers with fifteen or more employees, with enforcement through the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the federal courts.

The consequences of this regulatory gap are visible in employment data. The Periodic Labour Force Survey data shows that PwDs are disproportionately concentrated in informal employment agricultural labour, domestic work, and self-employment which offers no social security protection and no scope for workplace accommodation. The formal private sector, which offers better wages, social security, and career development, remains substantially inaccessible to PwDs in the absence of mandatory anti-discrimination regulation.

5.6 Enforcement Mechanisms

The enforcement architecture of the RPWD Act, 2016 includes the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities at the national level and State Commissioners at the state level, who are empowered to receive and investigate complaints, make recommendations, and take other measures to ensure compliance with the Act. The Act also provides for the adjudication of complaints by the District Courts and the establishment of Special Courts for the speedy trial of offences under the Act.

In practice, the enforcement mechanism is severely under-resourced and under-utilized. Many states have not appointed State Commissioners on a permanent basis. The Central and State Commissioners lack powers of enforcement beyond the ability to recommend action, creating a significant gap between the right to complain and the ability to obtain a remedy. The absence of a dedicated regulatory body with proactive investigation and enforcement powers comparable to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the United States means that enforcement is largely complaint-driven and reactive.

Judicial enforcement through the Supreme Court and High Courts has been more effective. Courts have consistently held that PwDs are entitled to reasonable accommodation in competitive examinations and in the workplace, that reservation norms must be strictly enforced, and that the failure of government establishments to fill reserved vacancies constitutes a justiciable violation of statutory and constitutional rights. However, individual litigation is an expensive and time-consuming remedy that is inaccessible to most PwDs.

5.7 Comparative Analysis: CRPD, ADA, and UK Equality Act

The CRPD establishes the most comprehensive international standard for employment rights of PwDs. Article 27 of the CRPD requires States Parties to recognize the right of persons with disabilities to work, on an equal basis with others, and to prohibit discrimination in employment, promote self-employment and entrepreneurship, provide reasonable accommodation in the workplace, and promote vocational and professional rehabilitation. India's obligations under the CRPD provide the benchmark for evaluating the adequacy of domestic legislation.

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990, as amended in 2008, prohibits discrimination against qualified individuals with disabilities in job applications, hiring, firing, advancement, compensation, job training, and other terms and conditions of employment. The ADA applies to employers with fifteen or more employees, covering a significant portion of the private sector. The reasonable accommodation obligation under the ADA is robust and

well-developed through extensive judicial interpretation, providing a model for India's more nascent reasonable accommodation framework.

The UK Equality Act 2010 consolidates anti-discrimination law across protected characteristics, including disability. The Act imposes a duty to make reasonable adjustments on employers and service providers, covering both direct disability discrimination and indirect discrimination through provisions, criteria, or practices that disadvantage disabled persons. The UK's enforcement mechanism through Employment Tribunals provides a relatively accessible forum for PwDs to vindicate their rights.

Compared with these frameworks, the RPWD Act, 2016 falls short in several respects: its limited coverage of the private sector, the unclear content of the reasonable accommodation obligation, the absence of strong enforcement mechanisms with investigative powers, and the inadequacy of remedies for individual complainants.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 represents a substantial improvement over its predecessor and a significant step towards CRPD compliance. The expansion of recognized disabilities, the increase in reservation quotas, the introduction of statutory reasonable accommodation, and the provisions for inclusive education and welfare all mark positive developments. However, the Act's critical deficiencies particularly its limited private sector coverage, ambiguous reasonable accommodation standards, and weak enforcement mechanisms prevent it from delivering substantive employment equality for PwDs.

The following recommendations are proposed: First, the reasonable accommodation obligation should be extended to private sector employers, commencing with establishments of a certain size (e.g., twenty or more employees), with a phased expansion to smaller establishments. Second, the RPWD Act should be amended to define the factors to be considered in the undue burden assessment, providing clearer guidance to employers and adjudicators. Third, a dedicated enforcement body with proactive investigation powers, similar to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, should be established with sufficient resources and expertise. Fourth, non-filling of reserved vacancies should be made subject to mandatory time-bound backlog filling and financial penalties. Fifth, government procurement policies should be used to incentivize disability-inclusive practices in the private sector. Sixth, assistive technology should be made available in all government workplaces, and public

procurement schemes should support the development of affordable assistive technology for the private sector.

Ultimately, the realization of employment rights for PwDs in India requires a shift from a charity-based model, which views disability employment as a welfare measure, to a rights-based model, which recognizes that employment exclusion constitutes a violation of fundamental rights. Law can drive this shift, but only if it is complemented by robust enforcement, public awareness, and the active participation of PwDs in the development and monitoring of employment policies.

Bibliography

- Anupama, R. (2013). Intellectual disabilities and the employment gap in India: A socio-legal study. *Disability Studies Quarterly*, 33(4), 85-101.
- Bhatt, S., & Singh, V. (2017). The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016: A comparative assessment. *Journal of the Indian Law Institute*, 59(1), 38-58.
- Davar, B. (2019). Mental health disability and the employment rights deficit in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 54(12), 74-85.
- Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities. (2019). Annual Report 2018-19. Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India.
- Government of India. (2016). Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Ministry of Law and Justice.
- Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India, (2016) 7 SCC 761 (Supreme Court of India).
- Mehrotra, N. (2011). Disability rights and the law in India: An appraisal of the Persons with Disabilities Act, 1995. *Disability & Society*, 26(5), 573-585.
- Mehta, P. (2018). Judicial interpretation of disability rights in India: A critical survey. *Asian Law Review*, 15(2), 195-215.
- National Centre for Promotion of Employment for Disabled People. (2019). Reasonable accommodation in Indian workplaces: A survey report. NCPEDP.
- National Federation of the Blind v. Union Public Service Commission, (1993) 1 SCC 411 (Supreme Court of India).
- Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. United Nations.

- Oliver, M. (2013). The social model of disability: Thirty years on. *Disability & Society*, 28(7), 1024-1026.
- Samant, D., & Bhambhani, M. (2015). Employment patterns among persons with disabilities in urban India: Evidence from five cities. *Indian Journal of Social Work*, 76(2), 105-124.
- Shah, C. (2020). Disability and multiple discrimination: Intersections of caste, gender, and disability in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 55(7), 49-56.
- Sharma, K., & Gupta, R. (2021). RPWD Act compliance: Evidence from RTI responses. Centre for Disability Studies, Working Paper No. 8.
- United Nations. (2006). *Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and Optional Protocol*. United Nations.
- *Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission*, (2021) 5 SCC 370 (Supreme Court of India).
- Waddington, L., & Hendriks, A. (2002). The expanding concept of employment discrimination in Europe: From direct and indirect discrimination to reasonable accommodation. *International Journal of Comparative Labour Law and Industrial Relations*, 18(4), 403-427.



WHITE BLACK
LEGAL