



Employment discrimination and disability: Legal remedies and best practices

Jyoti Poonia

Department of law, Baba Mastnath University, Rohtak, Haryana, India

Abstract

Despite significant legislative and judicial advancements, a profound disparity in employment outcomes persists for people with disabilities. This report presents a comprehensive, tri-national analysis of employment discrimination and disability, focusing on the legal frameworks, remedial processes, and strategic best practices in the United States, the United Kingdom, and India. The analysis reveals a stark contrast between legal intent and lived reality, evidenced by persistent employment gaps and occupational segregation. This discrepancy is fundamentally rooted in a historical paradigm that viewed disability as an individual's deficit, rather than a societal issue of inaccessibility and systemic exclusion. The report argues that a conceptual shift toward the social and human rights models of disability is essential to achieve substantive equality. Through a detailed comparative examination of the U.S. Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the U.K. Equality Act 2010, and the Indian Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016, the analysis identifies distinct legislative approaches—from the reactive, litigation-centric model of the U.S. to the proactive, anticipatory duty of the U.K. and the quota-based, constitutional framework of India. The report further explores how landmark judicial decisions have shaped, clarified, and expanded these legal protections. It concludes by presenting a compelling business case for disability inclusion, synthesizing evidence of enhanced innovation and financial performance among leading companies. The report's findings provide a strategic blueprint for policymakers and corporations to move beyond mere legal compliance toward the adoption of human-centric best practices that foster truly inclusive, equitable, and productive workplaces.

Keywords: Disability, employment discrimination, americans with disabilities act (ADA), equality act 2010, rights of persons with disabilities act (RPWD) 2016, reasonable accommodations, inclusive hiring, social model of disability, legal remedies, workplace inclusion

Introduction

Employment discrimination against people with disabilities remains a formidable global challenge, manifesting in stark disparities in labor force participation, career advancement, and economic parity. This report delves into the complexities of this issue by examining its legal, judicial, and corporate dimensions across three key jurisdictions: The United States, the United Kingdom, and India. The analysis is structured to demonstrate that while significant legislative progress has been made, true equality requires a fundamental shift in both legal and social paradigms.

1. The Persistent Disability Employment Gap

A critical first step in understanding this challenge is to acknowledge the scale of the problem. Data consistently shows a wide and persistent gap in employment-population ratios between individuals with and without disabilities. In the United States, for example, the Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that in 2024, the employment-population ratio for people with a disability was 22.7 percent, a dramatic contrast to the 65.5 percent ratio for those without a disability. This chasm is not merely a U.S. phenomenon. In the United Kingdom, the disability employment gap stood at 28.5 percentage points in Q2 2024, with employment rates of 53.1 percent for disabled people compared to 81.6 percent for non-disabled people. The disparity is particularly acute for individuals with more severe conditions. In Ireland, which provides a valuable proxy, the employment rate for people with a disability "to a great extent" was just 27 percent in 2022, resulting in a staggering 44 percentage-point gap when compared to non-disabled individuals.

The issue extends beyond a simple lack of employment opportunities. A deeper examination of labor force characteristics reveals qualitative disparities that point to systemic barriers. In the U.S., workers with a disability are nearly twice as likely to work part-time as their non-disabled counterparts (31 percent vs. 17 percent). Furthermore, they are significantly less likely to hold management, professional, and related occupations (37.9 percent vs. 44.1 percent), while being overrepresented in sales, service, and production roles. This data suggests that while legal frameworks may address the initial barrier of entry into the workforce, they have not yet fully resolved the more nuanced issues of career advancement and economic parity. The challenge, therefore, is not only about finding a job but about ensuring access to high-quality, long-term career opportunities.

2. A Conceptual Paradigm Shift: From Medical to Social Models

The historical understanding of disability has profoundly influenced societal responses and, consequently, legislative frameworks. The outdated medical model of disability views the individual as having a "problem" to be "fixed" or "cured". From this perspective, a person with a disability is primarily a patient, and their impairment is a health condition at odds with the "norm". This approach sees people with disabilities as objects of pity or charity, passive recipients of care rather than active participants in society. While this model may be medically relevant in a clinical setting, its application to social and professional life is both archaic and discriminatory, as it places the burden of

change on the individual rather than on the exclusionary environment.

In stark contrast, the social model of disability reframes the problem entirely. It posits that "disability" is not the inherent impairment itself but rather the result of the interaction between an individual's impairment and an environment rife with physical, attitudinal, and communication barriers. This model, which is the internationally recognized perspective and the foundation of the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), shifts the focus from "fixing the person" to "fixing society". It mandates that legal remedies and best practices should concentrate on removing these systemic barriers to create an enabling environment for all people to participate fully and effectively. The human rights model, a closely related concept, reinforces this view by asserting that people with disabilities are "subjects with rights" who are capable of making their own decisions and are entitled to live with dignity and equality. This report's analysis of legal frameworks and corporate practices is grounded in this crucial conceptual evolution, as it is the very foundation upon which effective and lasting change is built.

Comparative Legal Frameworks: A Tri-National Analysis

The legal landscape for disability discrimination varies significantly across nations, reflecting each country's unique historical, social, and political context. A comparative analysis of the frameworks in the U.S., U.K., and India reveals distinct philosophical and procedural approaches to achieving a common goal: preventing discrimination and fostering employment opportunity.

1. The United States: The ADA's Framework of Opportunity

The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) is the cornerstone of disability rights law in the U.S. It defines a person with a disability in three ways: having a physical or mental impairment that "substantially limits one or more major life activities"; having a history or record of such an impairment; or being "perceived by others" as having such an impairment. This definition is broad and does not name every covered impairment, allowing for judicial interpretation.

A central tenet of the ADA, particularly under Title I, is the requirement for employers with 15 or more employees to provide "reasonable accommodations" to qualified individuals with disabilities. This is a modification or adjustment to a job or work environment that enables a person with a disability to perform the essential functions of the job. Examples include altering work schedules, providing assistive technology, or modifying training materials. However, this duty is not absolute; an employer is not required to provide an accommodation that would cause an "undue hardship," defined as significant difficulty or expense. The ADA's framework is inherently reactive. The process for securing an accommodation typically begins with an employee's disclosure of a disability and its specific impact on a job duty or privilege of employment. If the disability is not obvious, the employer may request medical documentation to confirm the diagnosis and the need for accommodation. This reactive model, which places the onus on the individual to initiate a formal process, can

inadvertently create a barrier, as it relies on the employee's willingness and comfort to disclose a disability and navigate a potentially stigmatizing process.

2. The United Kingdom: The Equality Act 2010's Broad Reach

The U.K.'s legal approach is encapsulated in the Equality Act 2010, which consolidates and strengthens previous anti-discrimination laws. The Act defines disability as a physical or mental impairment that has a "substantial and long-term adverse effect on a person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day activities". This definition is intentionally broad, covering conditions that may not be visibly obvious, such as chronic back pain or clinical depression, and explicitly directs that the effect of mitigating measures (like medication or prosthetics) should be ignored when assessing the impairment's impact.

A significant and defining feature of the Equality Act is its "anticipatory" duty to make "reasonable adjustments". Unlike the reactive approach of the ADA, this duty requires employers and service providers to proactively anticipate the needs of disabled people and take steps to remove disadvantages, even before a specific request is made. This legal mandate directly aligns with the social model of disability, as it shifts the responsibility from the individual to the institution to remediate the environment. The Act also prohibits a range of discriminatory behaviors, including direct and indirect discrimination, and importantly, "unfavourable treatment for reasons arising from their disability". The landmark case of *Coleman v. Attridge Law* further expanded the scope of protection by establishing the concept of "associative discrimination," which was later codified in the Act to protect individuals, such as carers, who are discriminated against due to their association with a disabled person.

3. India: A Rights-Based Framework with a Quota System

India's framework for disability rights is rooted in its Constitution and codified in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016. This Act replaced a 1995 law and represents a powerful paradigm shift from a charity-based model to a rights-based approach, aligning with the UN CRPD. The Act defines a person with a disability as someone with a long-term physical, mental, intellectual, or sensory impairment which, in interaction with barriers, hinders their full and effective participation in society. The law also introduces the concept of "benchmark disability" for access to certain benefits.

The Indian legal system employs a distinct approach that combines general anti-discrimination principles with specific, affirmative measures. The RPwD Act mandates a 4 percent job reservation for persons with disabilities in government services and civil posts. While private establishments are exempt from this quota, they are required to adhere to a range of obligations, including publishing an Equal Opportunity Policy that details facilities, identified posts, training, and assistive devices for employees with disabilities. The legal foundation is strengthened by judicial interpretation, which has affirmed that the constitutional promises of equality (Article 14) and the right to life with dignity (Article 21) are fundamental rights for persons with disabilities. This framework presents a unique hybrid model that not only prohibits negative acts of discrimination but

also mandates positive action to ensure representation and inclusion in the workforce.

Table 1: Comparative Analysis of Legal Definitions & Statutory Protections

Feature	United States (ADA)	United Kingdom (Equality Act 2010)	India (RPwD Act 2016)
Legal Instruments	Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)	Equality Act 2010	Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016
Definition of Disability	Physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities	Physical or mental impairment with a substantial and long-term adverse effect on day-to-day activities	Long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairment which, in interaction with barriers, hinders participation in society
Duty of Accommodation/Adjustment	Reactive: Employer must provide "reasonable accommodation" to a known disability unless it causes "undue hardship"	Anticipatory: Employer has a positive, anticipatory duty to make "reasonable adjustments" to remove a disadvantage	Mandated Provision: Employers are required to provide reasonable accommodations and assistive devices
Scope of Coverage	Employers with 15 or more employees	All types of workers	4% reservation in government jobs; private establishments subject to obligations
Unique Protections	Also protects those with a record of or who are regarded as having a disability	Prohibits "associative discrimination" against carers and others	Rights are enshrined in the Constitution; includes provisions for free legal aid

Legal Remedies and Adjudication: Navigating the Complaint Labyrinth

While robust legal frameworks are essential, their effectiveness is ultimately determined by the procedural mechanisms available to individuals seeking redress. The pathways for filing a discrimination complaint and the subsequent adjudication processes reveal further distinctions in the legal philosophies of the U.S., U.K., and India.

1. Pathways to Redress in the United States

The U.S. complaint process is highly structured and often leads to formal litigation. For employment discrimination, the journey typically begins with filing a charge with the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) within a strict deadline, usually 180 or 300 days from the date of the discriminatory act. The EEOC is responsible for investigating the complaint. The process is non-adversarial, with the agency investigator gathering evidence to determine if discrimination occurred.

Throughout this period, the agency may offer to facilitate a voluntary settlement, a non-adversarial process that can avoid the need for court action. However, if a resolution is not reached, the EEOC may issue a "right-to-sue" letter, which is a necessary prerequisite for an individual to file a lawsuit in federal court. This legal path offers a broad range of potential remedies for successful claimants, including back pay, reinstatement, and damages for emotional distress. Punitive damages may also be awarded to punish an employer for malicious or reckless discriminatory acts, though these are capped based on the size of the employer. The U.S. system, with its emphasis on agency investigation followed by potential litigation, places significant procedural and financial burdens on both parties, particularly the claimant, who must navigate a complex legal landscape.

2. Dispute Resolution in the United Kingdom

The U.K. system introduces a crucial procedural step designed to encourage resolution before litigation: Early Conciliation. Before a claimant can file a claim with an Employment Tribunal, they must first contact ACAS (Advisory, Conciliation and Arbitration Service). While initiating this process is compulsory, participation in the

conciliation itself is voluntary for both parties. This procedural design serves as a gateway to the formal tribunal system and provides a free, independent, and confidential opportunity for the parties to reach a settlement without the need for court proceedings.

If conciliation fails, ACAS issues a certificate, which the claimant can then use to lodge a formal claim with an Employment Tribunal. The tribunal process involves several stages, including a Preliminary Hearing to manage the case and identify issues. For disability discrimination claims, a unique and critical stage is the submission of a "Disability Impact Statement" with medical records, in which the claimant must prove that their condition had a "substantial and long-term adverse effect" on their daily life. This procedural design highlights a fundamental philosophical difference from the U.S. system: the U.K. prioritizes out-of-court resolution from the outset, aiming to manage the caseload and potentially reduce the adversarial nature of the process.

3. Complaint Mechanisms in India

India's legal framework for redress is multifaceted, offering both administrative and judicial pathways. The RPwD Act mandates that every government establishment appoint a Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) to handle complaints internally. If a complainant is not satisfied with the GRO's action, they can file a complaint with the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities (CCPD) at the central level or the State Commissioner for state-level issues. These Commissioners are empowered to investigate complaints, recommend corrective measures, and even hold hearings, which may now be conducted online.

The Act also mandates the establishment of Special Courts in each district to handle offenses and violations, allowing for fines and imprisonment in certain cases, which can make directors and senior officers personally liable. The existence of these multiple avenues—from an internal grievance officer to a statutory commission and a specialized judicial court—provides diverse access points for justice. However, this fragmented system can also lead to confusion and slow grievance redressal, a challenge that is underscored by ongoing legal activism and judicial initiatives aimed at ensuring the law's full implementation and awareness.

Table 2: Comparative Analysis of Complaint and Redressal Processes

Step	United States	United Kingdom	India
Initial Step	File a Charge of Discrimination with the EEOC	Initiate compulsory Early Conciliation with ACAS	File a complaint with an internal Grievance Redressal Officer or Commissioner
Key Timeline	180 or 300 days from the discriminatory act	Within 3 months less one day from the discriminatory act	Within 3 months from the date of the grievance notice
Primary Venue	Federal Court (after a "right-to-sue" letter from the EEOC)	Employment Tribunal (after Early Conciliation fails)	Special Courts mandated by the RPwD Act
Typical Remedies	Reinstatement, back pay, compensatory & punitive damages (capped by employer size)	Uncapped compensation for losses and injury to feelings	Fines, penalties, and in some cases, imprisonment for directors and senior officers

The Evolving Role of Case Law and Judicial Interpretation

Statutory law, while foundational, is a living document shaped and clarified by judicial interpretation. Landmark court cases from each jurisdiction illustrate how legal principles have been applied, challenged, and ultimately expanded to keep pace with an evolving understanding of disability rights.

1. Landmark US Cases

The U.S. Supreme Court has played a critical role in defining the boundaries of the ADA. In a landmark 2001 case, *PGA Tour, Inc. v. Martin*, the court affirmed that the ADA’s protections extended to professional golf tournaments, requiring the PGA to make a reasonable modification (allowing a golf cart) for a golfer with a degenerative circulatory disease. The court ruled that the accommodation would not fundamentally alter the nature of the sport, setting a powerful precedent for the application of the ADA in "public accommodations".

Another pivotal case, *Bragdon v. Abbott* (1998), established that HIV infection qualified as a disability under the ADA, demonstrating the judiciary's role in broadening the law's definitions to include conditions not explicitly named.

However, judicial interpretations have not always been expansive. The Supreme Court's 1999 decisions in *Sutton v. United Airlines, Inc.* and *Murphy v. United Parcel Service, Inc.* narrowly interpreted the definition of "disability," holding that the mitigating effects of treatment or medication (such as eyeglasses or medication for high blood pressure) should be considered when determining if an impairment "substantially limits" a major life activity. This interpretation effectively excluded many individuals from ADA protection. In a powerful legislative response, Congress passed the ADA Amendments Act (ADAAA) in 2008, which explicitly broadened the statutory definition of disability and directed courts to construe the term broadly. This dynamic interplay between judicial interpretation and legislative action demonstrates how the law on disability rights is a living, evolving body of work that responds to both legal precedent and public policy.

2. Significant UK Precedents

In the U.K., judicial decisions have been instrumental in clarifying the scope and application of the Equality Act 2010. The 2008 European Court of Justice decision in *Coleman v. Attridge Law* is a foundational precedent. The case involved a mother who alleged discrimination because she was the primary carer for her disabled son. The court ruled that European law prohibited direct discrimination and harassment against an employee due to their "association" with a disabled person. This judgment laid the groundwork for the concept of associative

discrimination to be codified in the Equality Act 2010, significantly broadening protections beyond just the disabled individual.

A critical counterpoint, however, is the case of *Hainsworth v. Ministry of Defence*, which clarified the limits of the law by confirming that the duty to make "reasonable adjustments" does not extend to an individual who has an association with a disabled person. This legal distinction highlights the precise nature of the U.K.'s "reasonable adjustments" duty, which is focused on removing disadvantages to the disabled person themselves, not to a related third party. More recent cases, such as *Abrahart v. University of Bristol*, have further illustrated the legal liability that can arise from failing to make reasonable adjustments. In that case, the university was held liable under the Equality Act for failing to accommodate a student with depression and social anxiety disorder, demonstrating the tragic consequences that can result from a rigid adherence to policies over human needs.

3. Landmark Indian Judgments

In India, the judiciary has consistently reinforced the constitutional underpinnings of disability rights, particularly the right to live with dignity. The 2016 Supreme Court judgment in *Jeeja Ghosh v. SpiceJet Ltd.* is a powerful example of this. The case involved a disability rights activist who was de-boarded from a flight due to her cerebral palsy. The court awarded her compensation and powerfully affirmed that discrimination against people with disabilities is a violation of their dignity and personal liberty under Article 21 of the Constitution. This case served as a critical turning point, reinforcing the need for sensitivity and stronger enforcement across all sectors.

Another seminal judgment, *Union of India v. National Federation of the Blind* (2013), addressed the government's failure to implement the job reservation quota mandated by the 1995 PwD Act. The Supreme Court ruled that the reservation must be strictly implemented and applied to all stages of recruitment and promotion. This decision was a powerful affirmation of the quota system, forcing government departments to ensure compliance and opening up employment opportunities for thousands of qualified candidates who had been unfairly denied jobs. The 2021 case of

Vikash Kumar v. Union Public Service Commission further solidified the judiciary's commitment to flexible and human-centered interpretation. The court ruled that a civil services candidate with dysgraphia was entitled to a scribe, arguing that disability rights should not be restricted by rigid definitions and that a reasonable accommodation must be provided for genuine difficulties. This case exemplifies the Indian judiciary's willingness to go beyond the letter of the law to uphold its spirit.

Best Practices for Fostering Inclusive Workplaces Beyond Compliance

The legal analysis demonstrates that while legislative frameworks are essential, they are only one part of the solution. To truly bridge the disability employment gap, organizations must move beyond a compliance-based mindset to one of proactive inclusion. This approach is not merely a social responsibility; it is a strategic business imperative with a proven return on investment.

1. The Compelling Business Case for Inclusion

A robust body of evidence demonstrates a clear link between disability inclusion and corporate success. The Disability Index, which benchmarks companies on their disability inclusion practices, shows that leaders in this area realize 1.6 times more revenue, 2.6 times more net income, and 2 times more economic profit than their peers. A study by Forrester also found that for every dollar invested in accessibility, companies see an average return of over nine dollars. These financial benefits are not a happy coincidence but a direct result of tangible business advantages.

Firstly, disability inclusion provides access to an immense, untapped talent pool. A significant number of unemployed people with disabilities want to work but cannot find jobs. Companies that make their workplaces and processes accessible are better positioned to attract this skilled and motivated workforce. Secondly, diversity drives innovation. When teams are composed of individuals with different backgrounds and life experiences, including those with disabilities, they are better at problem-solving and are more likely to develop innovative products and services that cater to a broader market. An employee with a disability, for example, may be uniquely positioned to identify and propose improvements to make a product more accessible, benefiting both the consumer and the business. Finally, a commitment to inclusion strengthens brand loyalty and market position by gaining the trust and business of the large and powerful disability community, along with their families, friends, and allies.

2. Best Practices in Hiring and Recruitment

To attract and hire talent with disabilities, organizations must rethink their traditional recruitment processes. The first step is to use inclusive language in all job descriptions, focusing on essential skills and qualifications while avoiding unnecessary physical requirements or jargon. Job postings should also include explicit welcoming language, such as a statement affirming that the company encourages people with disabilities to apply and that reasonable accommodations are available upon request.

To broaden the talent pool, organizations should actively partner with disability-focused organizations and advertise on specialized job boards. The application process itself must be accessible, with online forms that are compatible with screen readers and a clear point of contact for applicants who need assistance. During the interview process, companies should standardize questions and offer accommodations in advance, such as providing interview questions beforehand or offering a sign language interpreter. A shift toward skill-based assessments over conventional interviews can also make the process more equitable and allow companies to discover untapped potential.

3. Best Practices in Workplace Culture and Accommodations

Once hired, a strong, inclusive culture is vital for retaining and advancing employees with disabilities. A key component of this is a transparent and effective reasonable accommodation process. An employer must engage in an "interactive process" with the employee to identify and implement effective accommodations. The process should be confidential, and all parties should document each step to maintain an accurate record. Examples of effective accommodations include flexible work arrangements, assistive technology like screen readers or voice-to-text software, and physically accessible workplaces with ramps and accessible restrooms. The implementation of these accommodations is not only a legal obligation but also a productivity enhancer that empowers employees to perform their jobs effectively.

Beyond accommodations, fostering an inclusive culture requires a commitment from leadership and ongoing training for all employees. Leadership's visible championship of diversity sets the tone for the entire organization. Company-wide training on disability etiquette, inclusive language, and best practices for collaboration can help break down stereotypes and build an environment where employees feel safe to voice their needs. The establishment of Employee Resource Groups (ERGs) provides peer support, mentorship, and advocacy, which has been shown to increase retention and satisfaction among disabled employees. These strategic, human-centric policies are a tangible manifestation of a shift from the outdated medical model to the proactive, social model of disability. The financial and innovation benefits are not accidental; they are the direct result of a culture that values and integrates disability as a source of strength, not a deficit to be managed.

Table 3: Statistical Overview of Disability Employment Gaps and Best Practice Outcomes

Statistic	Value (Jurisdiction)	Source
U.S. Employment-Population Ratio (People with a Disability)	22.7%	
U.S. Employment-Population Ratio (People without a Disability)	65.5%	
U.K. Disability Employment Gap (Q2 2024)	28.5 percentage points	
Ireland Employment Gap (for "great extent" disability)	44 percentage points	
Companies with a Disability ERG (2024)	93% (of participating companies)	
Companies with Accessible Digital Product Policy (2024)	71% (of participating companies)	
Companies with a Centralized Accommodations Fund (2024)	57% (of participating companies)	
Revenue Advantage of Inclusion Leaders	1.6x more revenue than peers	
Net Income Advantage of Inclusion Leaders	2.6x more net income than peers	
Productivity Advantage of Inclusion Leaders	25% more productive than peers	

Conclusion

The analysis presented in this report reveals that while legal frameworks in the United States, the United Kingdom, and India have made significant strides, they have not yet fully achieved substantive equality for people with disabilities in the workplace. Persistent employment gaps, career stagnation, and a higher prevalence of part-time work and lower-skilled occupations demonstrate that legal protections, while vital, are often insufficient on their own. The central challenge lies in the enduring influence of the medical model of disability, which places the burden on the individual, in contrast to a holistic approach that demands systemic, societal change.

The comparative legal analysis underscores this point. The U.S. ADA, while groundbreaking, operates on a fundamentally reactive model, requiring individuals to initiate the accommodation process, which can be a significant barrier. The U.K.'s Equality Act and its "anticipatory" duty to make reasonable adjustments offers a more progressive, proactive model that aligns with the social model of disability by mandating that employers address barriers before they are even encountered. India's framework, with its constitutional roots and mandatory job quotas, presents a third, distinct approach that uses affirmative measures to actively redistribute opportunities, though it is not without its own challenges in implementation and enforcement.

Landmark judicial decisions have been critical to the evolution of these laws, with courts in all three nations expanding the scope of legal protection, clarifying complex definitions, and reinforcing the fundamental right to dignity. These judgments, however, also expose the limitations of static legal text, affirming that a living law requires continuous judicial interpretation to remain relevant and effective.

Ultimately, the path to substantive equality requires a concerted effort that transcends legal compliance. It demands that corporations recognize the compelling business case for disability inclusion, which is proven to drive innovation, enhance productivity, and increase financial returns. The best practices identified in this report—from designing inclusive hiring processes and providing accessible technology to fostering a culture of open communication and leadership commitment—are not just a checklist of good deeds. They are a strategic blueprint for business transformation that harnesses the full potential of a diverse talent pool.

The final conclusion is a call to action. For policymakers, it is a recommendation to learn from the most effective elements of each legal system and to continually refine legislation to reflect the social and human rights models of disability. For businesses, it is an appeal to move beyond outdated mindsets and embrace the strategic imperative of creating truly inclusive workplaces. For the legal and corporate communities, it is a reminder that the goal is not to merely avoid litigation but to create a society where employment discrimination on the basis of disability is not a problem to be solved, but a relic of the past.

References

1. Ministry of Law and Justice, Government of India. The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. Retrieved from <https://legislative.gov.in/sites/default/files/A2016-49.pdf>
2. Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities Divyangjan. The National Policy for Persons with Disabilities, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment, Government of India, 2006. Retrieved from <https://depwd.gov.in/en/policy/national-policy/>
3. Office of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities CCPD. Equal Opportunity Policy, 2025. Retrieved from <https://ccpd.nic.in/equal-opportunity-policy/>
4. World Health Organization WHO South-East Asia Region. n.d. Disability SEARO. Retrieved from <https://www.who.int/india/health-topics/disability>
5. UK Government. 2010. Equality Act 2010. Retrieved from <https://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2010/15/contents>
6. Office for National Statistics ONS. Outcomes for disabled people in the UK, 2021. Retrieved from <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/disability/articles/outcomesfordisabledpeopleintheuk/2021>
7. GOV.UK. The UK's follow-up Report to the 2016 inquiry by the UN Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/639b0a96e90e072182dffe8f/FINAL_Web-Accessible_UK_2022_follow-up_inquiry_report_UNCRPD.pdf
8. Scope UK. n.d. Disability facts and figures. Retrieved from <https://www.scope.org.uk/media/disability-facts-figures>
9. ADA.gov. n.d. Guide to Disability Rights Laws. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.ada.gov/resources/disability-rights-guide/>
10. American Bar Association. (n.d.). History of Disability Rights Milestones and Laws. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/groups/diversity/disabilityrights/about_us/timeline/
11. ResearchGate. The Americans with Disabilities Act at 25 Years. Lessons to Learn from the Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. Author Robyn M. Powell, 2015. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/280297591_the_americans_with_disabilities_act_at_25_years_lessons_to_learn_from_the_convention_on_the_rights_of_people_with_disabilities
12. U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC). (n.d.). The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and Sections 501 and 505 of the Rehabilitation Act of, 1973. Retrieved from <https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/guidance/americans-disabilities-act-1990-and-sections-501-and-505-rehabilitation-act>