

**ORDER SHEET**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SINDH, BENCH AT SUKKUR**  
Constitution Petition No.D-2141 of 2025

|                        |                                       |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| <b>Date of hearing</b> | <b>Order With Signature Of Judge.</b> |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|

**Before:**

***Mr. Justice Adnan-ul-Karim Memon***  
***Mr. Justice Abdul Hamid Bhurgri***

|                 |                                                                                    |
|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Applicant       | Moin Akhtar, son of Akhtar Hussain<br>Through Mr. Sundar Khan Chachar,<br>Advocate |
| The State       | Through Mr. Zulfiqar Ali Naich,<br>Assistant A.G Sindh                             |
| Date of hearing | 15.06.2026                                                                         |
| Date of order   | 15.06.2026                                                                         |

**ORDER**

**Adnan-ul-Karim Memon J.-** The petitioner has sought a declaration that the respondents' failure to appoint him against the 5% quota reserved for differently abled persons in BPS-01 to BPS-04 posts was unlawful and requested directions for his appointment to a suitable post.

2. The learned AAG, relying on comments filed by the Deputy Commissioner, Sukkur, submitted that the petitioner had appeared in the walk-in interviews conducted by the District Selection Committee in January 2026; however, he was neither shortlisted nor recommended for appointment, while 20 other differently abled candidates were recommended in accordance with the applicable law and policy. It was further stated that his case would be considered if a suitable vacancy arose in the future.

3. Upon being confronted with the legal position, learned counsel for the petitioner requested disposal of the petition in terms of an earlier order of this Court, wherein it was held that unemployment, financial hardship, or disability alone do not create an enforceable right to public employment, though the authorities must ensure compliance with the reserved quota and consider eligible differently abled candidates for future vacancies.

4. This Court is of the view that no case for further interference is made out at this stage. Nevertheless, considering the petitioner's

status as a differently abled person, the respondents are directed to strictly comply with the quota reserved for differently abled persons and to consider the petitioner's candidature for any future BPS-01 to BPS-04 vacancy in accordance with law, rules, eligibility, and merit.

5. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with all pending applications.

**JUDGE**

**JUDGE**

M.Ali\*