



CDLA presents...

Empowerment through Law: A Disability Rights Newsletter

Edition III

Equal Examination Facilities for Persons with Disabilities in India (Gulshan Kumar vs Institute of Banking Personnel Selection & Ors.)

Introduction

India's constitutional guarantee of equality and dignity extends to people with disabilities (PwDs) generally, specifically in the spheres of education and public service. Article 14 guarantees equality before law, while Article 21 guarantees the right to life and liberty of persons, the latter of which is interpreted to include the right to live with dignity. Courts have emphasized that such rights are "hollow" if they do not include PwDs. The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 ("RPwD Act") provides statutory effect to such principles. Section 3 charges the State with securing equality and non-discrimination, mandating the government to "take necessary steps to ensure reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities." Section 17 deals with the sphere of education, requiring "appropriate adaptations in the curriculum and exam system," such as being given extra time or being provided with a scribe.

Therefore, both constitutional jurisprudence and the RPwD Act acknowledge that candidates with disabilities should have meaningful access to examinations and allied facilities.

Constitutional and Legislative Protection

Under Article 14, the State is required to promote inclusion for all, inclusive of those with disabilities, unless doing so would impose a disproportionate burden and is needless to achieve a legitimate aim. Article 16 enshrines the equality of opportunity in government employment, an arena where competitive exams serve as an entry point. Where disabilities are not mentioned, courts apply the logic of Article 14 to hold exam authorities accountable for discrimination.

Additionally, the Directive Principles of State Policy under Article 41, and international obligations such as Article 24 of the United Nation Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities ("UN CRPD") on education of children with disabilities, affirm that education and training must be available to PwDs. The RPwD Act enshrines these principles as well. Section 3 states that PwDs "enjoy the right to equality, life with dignity... and respect for [their] integrity equally with others," and bars disability-based discrimination. Most importantly, Section 3(5) requires "reasonable accommodation," that is, adjustments and changes to ensure the participation of PwDs on an equal footing without causing undue hardship. Section 16 of the Act imposes a responsibility on all educational institutions to accept children with disabilities and avoid refusal of admission on grounds of disability, while Section 17(i) mandates schools and colleges to give additional time on examinations and furnish scribes or amanuenses as required. These provisions indicate that exam adjustments are a right under the law, rather than a privilege reserved for a few.

The Act also defines key terms such as Section 2(r) of the RPwD Act, which establishes a "benchmark disability" to be 40% or above as a disability; Section 2(s) of the Act defines "person with disability" without any percentage requirement. Notably, the Act itself does not restrict

accommodations (such as scribes) to “benchmark” cases alone; the benchmark criterion mostly impacts reservation quotas only. Therefore, the law envisages supporting any student with a disability impacting examination performance. This legislative scheme, read with Articles 14 and 21, paves the way for judicial enforcement of equal exam facilities.

Judicial Precedents and Reasonable Accommodation

Before the case of *Gulshan Kumar v. Institute of Banking Personnel Selection & Ors.* (“*Gulshan Kumar*”), the Supreme Court dealt with exam accommodations in *Vikash Kumar v. UPSC*, holding that withholding scribes or additional time to candidates with less than 40% disability breached Articles 14 and 21, highlighting that reasonable accommodation under the RPwD Act, 2016 is at the heart of equality and non-discrimination. Thereafter, in *Avni Prakash v. National Testing Agency*, the Court reaffirmed that a benchmark disability is not a requirement for such accommodations. These judgments set a precedent that exclusion on the sole criteria of disability percentage is violative of the RPwD Act, and instructed exam authorities to take a general, contextual approach. These were the principles that set the stage for the *Gulshan Kumar* ruling in 2025.

Gulshan Kumar v. Institute of Banking Personnel Selection & Ors. (2025)

The case of *Gulshan Kumar v. Institute of Banking Personnel Selection* was a landmark Supreme Court ruling that applied the above-mentioned rules in a concrete manner to banking and other recruitment tests. The petitioner, Gulshan Kumar, was afflicted with focal hand dystonia (a permanent writer's cramp) and was certified as having a 25% permanent disability. In spite of a NIMHANS certification stating that he needed a scribe, Kumar was consistently refused exam facilities, such as an amanuensis (one who takes dictation) and additional time, by various bodies such as the IBPS, SBI, SSC and state commissions, as he failed to fulfill the 40% “benchmark” requirement. Therefore, he moved a writ petition under Article 32, in the nature of a PIL, for a mandamus ordering the authorities to provide the necessary facilities for his upcoming exams.

The case was decided by a two-judge Bench, which unanimously held that Kumar’s treatment was unconstitutional and against the RPwD Act. It held that “all disabled candidates are entitled to use scribes for writing exams, regardless of the benchmark disabilities criteria being met.” The judgement opined that all concessions provided to able-bodied candidates must also be provided to PwD candidates, and that there can be no discrimination in providing examination facilities to candidates. This neatly put the 40% rule beyond the ambit of allowable exam policy.

Referring to *Vikas Kumar*, *Avni Prakash*, and the case of *Arnab Roy* in 2024, the Court reaffirmed that reasonable accommodation is a “positive obligation” and “central to secure equality for all persons with disabilities.” In its judgment, the Court observed that the non-discrimination directive of the RPwD Act (Section 3) and the education provisions (Section

17) make no room for exclusionary eligibility. Citing precedents, the Court found that without accommodation the constitutionally protected rights to equality and life under Article 21 would “ring hollow” for PwDs. Therefore, Gulshan Kumar categorically extended the previous findings, that exam concessions (scribes, extra time, etc.) have to be provided for any candidate whose disability impairs his power of writing, regardless of any cutoff benchmark.

Policy Directives and Reforms

The Gulshan Kumar ruling instructed the Ministry of Social Justice to revisit and amend its August 2022 Office Memorandum, eliminating the benchmark disability criterion and providing far-reaching and uniform accommodations for disabled test takers across the country. For instance, the Court mandated all examining authorities (UPSC, IBPS, SSC, etc.) to adopt the revised guidelines uniformly and hold periodic awareness and training sessions on disability rights. To reduce the burden on courts and to have a more internal mechanism, a central redressal portal is to be created for PwD candidates for lodging complaints. Candidates shall also be given time prior to the exam to sit down and familiarise themselves with their scribe in order to coordinate effectively during the test.

Conclusion

Gulshan Kumar v. IBPS has contributed towards India’s ever-growing disability rights jurisprudence. It confirms that individuals with disabilities, despite a “benchmark” requirement, possess an enforceable right to accommodation in examinations under the Constitution and the RPwD Act. By invalidating discriminatory limitations and calling for policy reforms in full measure, the Supreme Court has opened doors to an examination process that is more inclusive in nature. This not only protects the education and professional ambitions of millions of candidates who have disabilities, but also reflects a wider commitment to equality of opportunity within the Indian constitutional framework. In future, responsibility rests with the government and exam authorities to put these directives into letter and spirit. If properly implemented, Gulshan Kumar will make sure that no talent of an aspirant is lost because of avoidable obstacles, fulfilling the constitutional guarantee that opportunity and justice shall not be “hollow” to any citizen.

Written by Nilotpall Mukherjee

Supreme Court Upholds Inclusion in Medical Education

In its decision dated February 21, 2025, the Supreme Court of India issued a powerful affirmation of inclusive education by overturning a National Medical Commission (“NMC”) guideline requiring MBBS candidates to have “both hands intact with intact sensation and sufficient strength” to be eligible for admission. The Court reasoned that such a requirement is arbitrary, discriminatory, and unconstitutional, as it violates the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (“RPwD Act”) and the fundamental rights enshrined in the Indian Constitution.

Factual Matrix

In the present case, a complaint was filed by a medical student with a 58% handicap, 50% locomotor disability and 20% speech and language impairment, who was denied admission to the MBBS program at Government Medical College in Sirohi, Rajasthan. Despite achieving all academic standards and gaining a position on the merit list, the petitioner was disqualified only because of the NMC’s strict physical requirements. The Supreme Court deemed the rule to be fundamentally faulty, stating that the eligibility criteria in professional education, being medicine in the present instance, should promote functional capabilities over uniform physical standards. The Court challenged the NMC’s one size fits all approach, calling it legally and morally unacceptable.

In its judgement, the Court stated that sweeping restrictions such as “both hands intact” reflect an ableist worldview that fails to acknowledge how people with disabilities can efficiently execute medical tasks with the use of assistive technologies and appropriate modifications. The decision emphasised that impairment should be assessed using a functional lens, concentrating on what a person can accomplish rather than what they cannot. Justice Viswanathan emphasised that exclusion based merely on physical appearance or body structure, without regard for the individual’s real functional capacity, constitutes an unreasonable denial of opportunity.

Legal Provisions

This decision was based on constitutional provisions such as Article 14, which guarantees equal treatment under the law, and Article 41, which protects people with disabilities the right to labour, education, and public benefits. The Court also cited the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), which has been ratified and given legal effect by the Indian legislature, emphasizing the international need to ensure inclusive and barrier-free education and employment environments. The decision was supported by important precedents, such as Omkar Ramchandra Gond v. Union of India, which ruled that quantified disability could not be the sole basis for exclusion, and Om Rathod v. Director General of Health Services, which reaffirmed the importance of individualized reasonable accommodation in medical education.

The Court also raised concern over the disability assessment board's failure to justify the refusal of admission in the petitioner's instance, stating that such assessments must be tailored and evidence-based. As a result, the Court ordered the NMC to amend its rules without delay. It mandated that the new framework be prepared in collaboration with domain experts and disability rights advocates. The Court also asked the NMC to provide a compliance affidavit by March 3, 2025, describing the progress on the amended rules.

This decision is a significant step forward in the protection of people with disabilities' rights, particularly their access to higher education and professional training. By challenging and removing ableist ideas inherent in policymaking, the Supreme Court has reinforced the notion that exclusion is the result of institutional failure rather than individual inability. It prepares the path for structural reforms that acknowledge diversity of ability and underlines the constitutional guarantee of equality, dignity, and non-discrimination in education and beyond.

Written by Anshika Pal

Breaking Barriers: Supreme Court on inclusion of visually impaired candidates into judicial services

Introduction

In January 2024, the mother of one Alok Singh wrote a letter to then Chief Justice Of India, D. Y. Chandrachud, that Rule 6A of Madhya Pradesh Judicial Services (Recruitment and Conditions of Service) Rules, 1994 (“Rule 6A”) barred her son, a blind candidate, from applying for the judicial services exam in the state. The Supreme Court proceeded to take *Suo motu* cognisance by turning the letter into a writ petition under Article 32 of the Constitution. The Bench then issued notice to the Secretary General of the Madhya Pradesh High Court, the State of Madhya Pradesh and the Union of India. That same year, the Court in an interim order allowed candidates with disabilities to sit the exam, and could be called for an interview provided that they achieved the requisite cutoff marks for SC/ST candidates. However, the validity of the law itself was not considered at the time. In March 2025, the Bench comprising Justices JB Pardiwala and R. Mahadevan finally examined the unconstitutionality of Rule 6A and Rule 7 of the Madhya Pradesh Judicial Services Rules, 1994 (“Rule 7”) by denying equal opportunities to people with disabilities.

The Crux of the Matter

On hearing arguments from the *amicus curiae*, the Supreme Court ultimately came to the conclusion that denying persons with disabilities from writing a public service exam was a violation of their fundamental rights. It was contention majorly relied on by the petitioner’s side was that of Section 34 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, contending that the provision is also applicable to reservations provided in judicial services. The intervenor or interested third party in the case brought to light various reserved posts for people with disabilities in different high courts across India, wherein only a few have actually implemented measures for reservation. Further, it was argued that there is an onus on the government to identify posts in institutions that could be reserved for such candidates, in line with Section 33 of the RPwD Act.

Rule 6A, which excludes visually impaired and low vision candidates from appointment in the judicial service, was struck down by the Bench for being unconstitutional insofar as the exclusion of visually impaired candidates. Rule 7, which prescribed additional prerequisites for PwDs, either three years of service or securing 70% marks in the first attempt, was also partially struck down for being violative of the principle of reasonable accommodation.

The Bench comprising Justices JB Pardiwala and R Mahadevan reasoned that in consonance with the fundamental rights and the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities, the aforementioned Rules were violative of established legislation and disability jurisprudence in India.

Relying on precedents, the Court laid emphasis on cases such as Union of India & Ors v. National Federation of Blind & Ors., wherein employment was held as a key factor in the inclusion and empowerment of people with disabilities due to social barriers in employment, leading them to live in poverty. As in the present case, the Bench also brought light to the cases of Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India and Vikash Kumar v. UPSC, wherein the principle of reasonable accommodation was held to be “founded in the norm of inclusion” and to “pave the way for equality” and imposes a positive obligation on the State to provide adequate facilities to PwDs.

Lastly, the judgement sought to lay emphasis on the discrimination caused by excluding PwDs through rigid cut-offs in public examinations which deters substantive equality. It was stated that there is a duty on Constitutional courts to provide adequate opportunities as they would for any other candidate.

Way Forward

As suggested by the amicus in his arguments, training and sensitisation of employees and fellow employees working with persons with disabilities is of utmost importance. Further, in light of the equal opportunity concept, employers must ensure that persons with disabilities are reasonably accommodated so that they are able to contribute meaningfully and to the best of their abilities. Specifically with respect to judiciary, it was suggested that specific courtrooms be presided over by persons with disabilities; the State Government must provide infrastructure like scanners and screen readers; and a uniform reservation policy must be put in place across all States.

This judgement has come at a time where technology is at its peak innovation, and where investments can and must be made to make professional spaces, especially those like the judiciary, more inclusive and diverse. This would not only encourage and inspire more persons with disabilities to enter the judicial services, but would also contribute towards a more diverse panel of judges which would help in better judicial decision making.

Written by Gargee Chowdhury

Ministry of Education Reaffirms Commitment to Inclusive Education for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder

On the occasion of World Autism Awareness Day on April 2nd, the Government of India's Ministry of Education ("Ministry"), reaffirmed its unwavering commitment to ensuring inclusive and equitable education to all. The Ministry has been making concerted efforts to strengthen the community-based support system in collaboration with various Institutional and community-based action for Children with Special Needs ("CwSN"), especially those diagnosed with Autism Spectrum Disorder ("ASD") as a focal point in furthering the commitments in the National Education Policy ("NEP"), 2020.

Samagra Shiksha Scheme

As a part of the centrally sponsored scheme "Samagra Shiksha," the Ministry has institutionalised Block Resource Centres ("BRC's") as a point of entry for children with autism, to utilise the services in schools and community bases for therapy-based interventions and delivery services. These are areas where inclusive education becomes more than just an ideal. BRC's can provide an array of core therapies, each designed to facilitate specific developmental challenges associated with autism and other related neurodevelopmental disorders. These include occupational therapy which helps improve fine motor skills, sensory integration, and the ability to function independently in daily life; physiotherapy which improves muscle tone, posture, gross motor coordination, and physical mobility in children with neuromuscular difficulties; speech therapy which addresses difficulties with delayed speech, articulation, and social-communication skills, which are often part of autism. Lastly, individualised counselling and behaviour support utilised to promote emotional self-regulation, social engagement, and psychological wellness.

All BRCs are staffed with trained resource persons, special educators, and licensed therapists, working closely with parents, caregivers and school teachers. They formulate and implement an Individualised Education Plan ("IEPs") and Intervention Plan ("IIPs"), by accounting for each child's specific needs. Moreover, BRCs conduct regular screening camps, family counselling and capacity-building programs. They also provide assistive devices, Teaching Learning Materials ("TLM"), and other supportive devices aimed at ensuring that children with ASD have the best possible learning context.

Way Forward

The Ministry has emphasised the combination of therapy services and learning in a classroom by building consensus for an integrated and inclusive educational space. This involves developing accessible infrastructure, providing digital learning tools, and establishing partnerships with state government health and social welfare departments to support the inclusion of children with autism in mainstream academic settings, while also

acknowledging their disabilities, challenges, and valuable contributions.

In order to do so, the Ministry is appealing to schools, education providers, and parents to engage with and make use of the resources and services available through the BRCs. State and district-level education leaders have been urged to use a mindful approach for partnerships with local health and social services to strengthen the ecosystem that fosters inclusive education.

On this World Autism Awareness Day, the education sector is called upon to lead awareness, acceptance, and true inclusion for children with autism spectrum disorder (ASD), and to ensure no child is left behind in access to knowledge and development.

Written by Manasvi Singh

Reservations for Persons with Disabilities: Vertical and Horizontal Quotas in Judicial Services

Intersectionality was a term coined in the late 1980s, describing different overlapping identities a person may be and how that affects their social capital. This concept was explored by the judiciary recently in the Rekha Sharma case.

The petitioner, Rekha Sharma, was a low-vision PwD candidate, who also fell in the EWS category, seeking a position in the Rajasthan Judicial Services. Although two spots were reserved for blind and low-vision candidates and she exceeded the minimum qualifying score, she was not selected as other PwD candidates with higher scores filled those positions. However, one of the candidates allotted the reserved seat belonged to the Schedule Tribe (ST) category. Therefore, Rekha Sharma contended that that candidate should have been adjusted against the ST vertical quota. This adjustment, she argued, would have created a vacant horizontal PwD spot, allowing her own selection.

The heart of this legal issue had to be decided by the Supreme Court, by determining which reserved category a person falls under when they qualify for multiple, such as a person with a disability (PwD) who is also from an economically weaker section (EWS). This necessitates a precise application of both horizontal and vertical reservations.

Understanding Horizontal and Vertical Reservations

Before trying to understand the legality of the matter, the distinction between vertical and horizontal reservations is crucial. Vertical reservation allocates seats to specific social groups such as Scheduled Castes (SC), Scheduled Tribes (ST), Other Backward Classes (OBC). on the other hand, horizontal reservation applies to reservations made in other categories, under Article 16(1), to categories such as women, persons with disabilities, veterans, etc. Horizontal reservations work across the vertical reservations by providing specific categorisations. Further, in vertical reservations, a specific number of seats are allotted to each category, whereas in horizontal reservation, a certain number of seats are fixed for the horizontal category, after which it will be adjusted against the vertical reservation seats. For instance, a woman candidate in a horizontal reservation, who might belong to the general category, will be given a general category seat after the requisite adjustment.

Despite this clarification, which was laid down in *Indra Sawhney v. Union of India*, courts have struggled with putting into effect the different reservations, facing questions about whether PwDs should be a separate category for calculating seats, if distinct cut-off lists are necessary for them, or if they can receive relaxed minimum scores. In the *Rekha Sharma case*, the Court further bifurcated horizontal reservations into two parts, that is,

compartmentalised horizontal reservation (CHR) and overall horizontal reservation (OHR). CHR, the Court explained, was where the horizontal seats would be adjusted within the vertical categories, conversely, OHR is where a horizontal seat, “women” for instance, would be reserved irrespective of the applicable vertical category.

The Supreme Court also drew from *Anil Kumar Gupta and Ors. vs. State of UP and Ors.* [(1995) 5 SCC 173], stating that special reservations such as those of women and PwDs ought not to be divided proportionally in the vertical categories, rather, they should be adjusted within those categories as per the overall seats allocated to them.

Rekha Sharma’s Legal Battle

In 2022, Sharma appealed against the non-declaration of separate cut-off marks for PwD candidates in the Rajasthan Judicial Services, where she initially lost before the Supreme Court. However, she reappeared for the 2024 Rajasthan Judicial Service Exams, where marks were not separately allotted to PwD candidates, leading to the filing of another writ petition before the High Court of Rajasthan (“HC”). Following the HC’s direction, the petitioner was allowed to appear for the interview and was subsequently called. However, on not clearing the requisite cut-offs, the petitioner’s name did not find itself on the list of selectees.

On this ground, the petitioner contended that more meritorious candidates who were allotted to the two reserved seats ought to be adjusted against the vertical reservation applicable to them, thereby freeing a seat for herself.

Following her persistent legal efforts, and given that the petitioner had secured the minimum qualifying marks in the exam, as well as being part of the EWS vertical reservation and the PwD horizontal reservation, she ought to be given a position in any vacant seat, or have created an extra seat in the Civil Judge (Junior Division).

While the outcome of this case was overall a positive one, it still exposes the vast gaps in litigation and slow judicial processes. The petitioner had first written the judicial services exam in 2021 and was only given recognition four years later, in 2025. Her hard work had only paid off nine years later when she was made a judicial officer. It becomes all the more important then to have fixed formulas for reservation to apply in such cases to avoid not only pendency in the judiciary but especially to avoid unnecessary delays and costs caused to the petitioner.

Way Forward

While the Supreme Court affirmed the need for a separate PwD category, clear implementation guidance remains absent. This problem is exacerbated by various government bodies and exam agencies creating their own rules, often leaving candidates like Rekha Sharma navigating a system where even the concept of equality is subject to judicial debate. This, therefore,

highlights the need for a consistent and standardized framework for handling reservations, one that acknowledges real-life complexities faced by marginalised communities. It also emphasises the necessity for explicit judicial guidance on interpretive and implementational lacunae concerning vertical and horizontal reservations.

Written by Ittaboina Rakesh

Supreme Court expands right to life to include accessible digital services

In the landmark judgement of Suchit Narang v. State of Uttarakhand, by reaffirming the rights of the disabled, the Uttarakhand High Court has quashed the conviction and 20-year jail term of a blind accused who was charged under the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act and sections of the Indian Penal Code (IPC). The Court noted that the denial of legal documents in Braille format amounted to a grave breach of the right of the accused to a fair trial and access to justice under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

The blind music teacher, who worked at a school for the blind, was convicted in 2024 for allegedly indulging in objectionable behaviour with minor students. He was convicted and sentenced to 20 years imprisonment under Sections 376 and 354-A of the IPC and Sections 4 and 10 of the POCSO Act. Upon conviction, the accused preferred an appeal against both the conviction and sentence on the grounds of procedural lapses and denial of his fundamental rights at the trial stage.

The main ground for the appeal was that, being a person of total visual impairment, the appellant was not given access to relevant legal documents in a disability-friendly mode, such as in Braille or audio format. All documents provided to him throughout the investigation and trial—the FIR, charge sheet, witness statements, and the judgment—were in Devanagari script, which he could not read. This essentially denied him the proper grasp of the nature of the charges brought against him and the ability to offer accurate and relevant information to his representatives.

A Division Bench headed by Chief Justice G. Narendar and Justice Alok Mahra of the Uttarakhand High Court upheld the appeal. The Court noted that refusal to make accessible documents available to the accused robbed him of the capacity to effectively participate in his defence. The Bench ruled that this lacuna “vitiating and rendered the trial unfair” because of the accused person's inability to read, understand, and refer to counsel properly. The ruling also observed that this default prejudiced the accused person's right to reply on his examination under Section 313 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, where the accused person is allowed to explain any circumstances coming in the evidence against him.

The Court drew from Section 12 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 in its judgement, which prescribes that individuals with disabilities should have access to the legal system on equal terms. This encompasses the responsibility of the State and its institutions to make public documents accessible by way of accessible formats, and to ensure that persons with disabilities receive reasonable support while proceedings are being conducted.

The Court said that “denying an accused person material documents and a description of material objects in a language that is comprehensible to them categorically compromises their right to comprehend the charges and the evidence against them.”

In consideration of these observations, the High Court quashed the previous conviction and sentencing, and referred the case for a new trial, mandating that all materials necessary for the hearing be produced in conformity with the requirements of accessibility. The Court also specifically instructed that the retrial should only proceed once the accused is supplied with all documents, pertinent to his case, in Braille or other appropriate forms. Subject to the retrial, the appellant has been released on bail against furnishing a bond for ₹25,000 and one surety of the same amount.

The High Court’s judgement is sure to have wider implications for the judiciary henceforth. The judgement has validated and emphasised the need to include disability accommodations at all levels of the judicial process, that is, investigation, trial, and sentencing. Further, India having ratified the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (UNCRPD), is obligated and expected to adhere to the principle of equal access to justice. The combined effect of the UNCRPD as well as this judgement puts domestic practices on the same line as international commitments.

The Uttarakhand High Court’s ruling is a powerful precedent and sends a strong message that procedural justice involves accessibility for everyone, especially people with disabilities. It supports the notion that justice is not only about the presence of legal counsel but also about making sure that the accused can completely understand and be a part of the proceedings against them.

In acknowledging the right to accessible legal documents as a component of an equitable trial, the Court has furthered the pursuit of inclusive justice and made a significant step towards a more balanced legal system.

Written by Kajol Nayak



THE TEAM



D i r e c t o r

Dr. Tanwi Shams

C o - D i r e c t o r s

Ms. Ayushi Srivastava

Ms. Solomon Athena K

E d i t o r i a l T e a m

Aditi Krishna (Editorial Board Head)

Kajol Nayak (Design)

Nilotpal Mukherjee

Anshika Pal

Gargee Chowdhury

Manasvi Singh

Ittaboina Rakesh



Connect with us on social media for future updates!

Linkedin: [Centre for Disability Law and
Advocacy](#)

Instagram: [nluo.cdla](#)

Email: cdla@nluo.ac.in
