ASHITA DUBEY V. STATE OF MADHYA PRADESH (W.P. NO. 5901/2019) : A LEGAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL STUDY OF THE 27% OBC RESERVATION IN M.P.

by

Dr. Mukesh Kumar Malviya

Associate Professor, Faculty of Law, Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi

ABSTRACT

This research paper presents an in-depth legal examination of the historic and controversial judgment delivered on October 9, 2026, by a Division Bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court (comprising Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anand Pathak and Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vinay Saraf) in the case of **Ashita Dubey v. State of Madhya Pradesh** (W.P. No. 5901/2019). Through this ruling, the Court declared the 2019 Amendment Act—which increased OBC reservation from 14% to 27% —unconstitutional and set it aside. The paper critically analyzes the constitutional aspects, judicial biases, and factual omissions overlooked by the High Court. Furthermore, it critiques the recommendations of the Mandal Commission, the core spirit of Articles 15(4) and 16(4), and the lackluster representation by the State Advocate General's office. Finally, the article highlights the socio-economic losses inflicted upon the state's majority OBC population by this verdict and outlines the legal arguments against it.

Keywords: Ashita Dubey Case, OBC 27% Reservation, Indra Sawhney Doctrine, Madhya Pradesh High Court, Social and Educational Backwardness.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

1. INTRODUCTION AND HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The framers of the Indian Constitution regarded social justice as the cornerstone of nation-building. To mainstream historically disadvantaged, exploited, and stratified social groups, affirmative action and reservation provisions were incorporated under Part III (Fundamental Rights) of the Constitution, specifically Articles 15(4) and 16(4). The Other Backward Classes (OBC) constitute a vast majority of the total population in Madhya Pradesh. There had been a long-standing demand that OBCs be granted adequate representation in public employment and higher education proportional to their population.

To address this historical and social imperative, the Government of Madhya Pradesh promulgated an ordinance in 2019, followed by the enactment of The Madhya Pradesh Public Services (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Act, 2019. This statutory amendment raised the OBC reservation quota from 14 percent to 27 percent. However, this amendment was challenged through various writ petitions before the Jabalpur High Court. After a prolonged, complex, and marathon legal battle lasting nearly seven years, the Hon'ble High Court delivered its final verdict on October 9, 2026, declaring the enhanced 13% unconstitutional and restricting the reservation ceiling back to 14%. This decision marks a critical turning point in Indian reservation jurisprudence regarding the debate between "numerical representation versus merit" and "formal versus substantive equality."

2. CASE TITLE AND COMPOSITION OF THE JUDICIAL BENCH

The primary title of this highly publicized legal dispute is Ashita Dubey & Ors. v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors. (Writ Petition No. 5901 of 2019). Alongside this, more than 90 connected petitions were heard collectively, encompassing disputes related to admissions and appointments across various medical, engineering, administrative (MPPSC), and other educational institutions in the state.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

The final and definitive hearing of this matter was conducted by a two-judge Division Bench of the Madhya Pradesh High Court, consisting of the following learned judges:

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Anand Pathak

Hon'ble Mr. Justice Vinay Saraf

Following marathon arguments presented by senior advocates from both sides, the Bench reserved its judgment in August 2026, which was ultimately pronounced and made public on October 9, 2026.

3. LEGAL, CONSTITUTIONAL, AND PRACTICAL FACTS OVERLOOKED BY THE HIGH COURT

A microscopic legal scrutiny of the Ashita Dubey judgment reveals that the Court completely bypassed several irrefutable legal principles, historical evidence, and ground realities that provided strong justification for the 27% reservation:

3.1. Neglect of the Concept of "Adequate Representation" in Proportion to Population

Article 16(4) of the Constitution explicitly states— "if the State is of the opinion that the backward classes are not adequately represented in the services under the State...". The OBC population in Madhya Pradesh exceeds 50%. Confining more than half of the state's population to a mere 14% representation cannot, by any stretch of imagination, be termed "adequate representation." The Court ignored this foundational principle of numerical justice.

3.2. Hyper-Technical Rejection of Empirical and Quantifiable Data

The Court dismissed the data and reports submitted by the State Government (such as the 2023 BRAUSS report and other surveys) on technical grounds. Under the rulings of the Supreme Court in M. Nagaraj (2006) and Jarnail Singh (2018), the primary duty of the state is to collect data. If there were minor technical shortcomings in the data, the Court ought to have issued policy directions for rectification rather than nullifying the statutory rights of an entire class.

3.3. Ignoring Extraordinary Circumstances under the 'Indra Sawhney' Ruling

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

The Court treated the 50% ceiling established in the 1992 Indra Sawhney judgment as an absolute and inflexible brick wall. However, the Indra Sawhney judgment itself carved out an exception that in remote, inaccessible areas or regions with unique social structures, this ceiling could be breached under extraordinary circumstances. The geographical and social realities of Madhya Pradesh's tribal and backward hinterlands fell well within this exception.

4. JUDICIAL PREJUDICES ADOPTED BY THE COURT AND THEIR SHARP CRITIQUE

An intellectual analysis of the Ashita Dubey judgment exposes underlying judicial prejudices that deserve sharp academic and legal criticism:

4.1. Equating "Political Dominance" with Social and Administrative Equality

In various paragraphs of the judgment, the Court relied on the factual observation that Madhya Pradesh has witnessed OBC Chief Ministers and ministers consecutively for over two decades, implying that the community is politically powerful and does not require additional reservation. Legally speaking, this is a deeply flawed and misleading argument. The occupancy of top political offices by a few individuals from a specific community does not automatically eradicate the social and administrative backwardness of crores of poor, landless, rural, and educationally deprived citizens belonging to that community. Political representation and administrative representation in public services and educational institutions are two distinct constitutional concepts.

4.2. Treating Selection in the Open/Unreserved Category as Grounds for Inutility of Reservation

The Court adopted a prejudiced perspective that since OBC candidates are securing selections in large numbers on their own merit within general/open category seats, granting them an additional 27% reservation is unwarranted. This reasoning runs counter to the basic spirit of the Constitution. The open category is not the monopoly of any single class; rather, it is strictly based on merit and transparency. If a meritorious student from a backward class secures a general seat through sheer hard work, it cannot be used as a pretext to shrink or suppress the quota meant for the entire deprived community.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

5. LAX AND NEGATIVE ROLE OF THE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S OFFICE OF MADHYA PRADESH

The failure in this entire legal battle was severely compounded by the sluggish, directionless, and defensive advocacy of the Madhya Pradesh Advocate General's office, which severely weakened the State's stance before the Court:

Failure to Submit Quantifiable Data: The Advocate General's office failed to place foolproof and compelling quantifiable data before the High Court that could withstand judicial scrutiny. Proper legal compilation of various commission reports was lacking.

Sluggish Representation During Interim Orders: Between 2019 and 2026, when appointments were stalled through various interim orders or the complex 87:13 formula was imposed, the State machinery displayed immense delays in filing robust and aggressive counter-affidavits.

Lack of Strategic Expertise: This highly sensitive social litigation was handled like routine government file-work, whereas it warranted a high-level legal cell backed by top-tier national constitutional jurists and sociologists.

6. WIDESPREAD DAMAGE TO THE OBC COMMUNITY DUE TO DENIAL OF RESERVATION (STATISTICS AND IMPACT)

The Madhya Pradesh High Court's verdict has inflicted severe socio-economic and educational blows on the majority population of the state:

Population Ratio vs. Quota: The OBC population in Madhya Pradesh ranges between 50.5% and 52%. Restricting them to a 14% reservation is a direct violation of the core spirit of Article 16(4).

Held-Up Posts (87:13 Formula): Approximately 9,500 posts under the Employees Selection Board (ESB) and around 1,300 posts under the Madhya Pradesh Public Service Commission (MPPSC) that were kept on hold under the 87:13 formula will now be distributed based on general category standards, depriving thousands of OBC youth of employment opportunities.

Economic and Collective Income Loss: Most OBC families in the state belong to marginal farming or labor backgrounds. This 13% reduction in government jobs will deprive thousands of households of steady income and social security annually.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

7. CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS, MANDAL COMMISSION, AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK SUPPORTING OBC RESERVATION

The Indian Constitution and jurisprudence contain robust provisions that unequivocally establish the necessity of OBC reservation:

7.1. Constitutional and Statutory Bases

Article 15(4): Inserted via the First Constitutional Amendment (1951), this provision empowers the State to make special provisions for the advancement of any socially and educationally backward classes of citizens (OBCs) or Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes.

Article 16(4): Provides the core constitutional basis for reservation in appointments or posts under the State to secure adequate representation for backward classes.

Article 340: Empowers the President to appoint a commission to investigate the conditions of socially and educationally backward classes and recommend measures for their amelioration.

7.2. Historical Recommendations of the Mandal Commission (1980)

The Second Backward Classes Commission, chaired by Bindeshwari Prasad Mandal, explicitly noted in its report that OBCs constitute 52% of India's population. The Commission recommended that to overcome social and educational backwardness, 27% reservation in public sector jobs and educational institutions must be implemented immediately. The spirit of the Mandal Commission remains the backbone of social justice.

8. IMPORTANT PRECEDENTS (CASE LAWS) SUPPORTING OBC RESERVATION

Several landmark rulings of the Supreme Court reinforce the constitutional validity of OBC reservation:

Indra Sawhney v. Union of India (1993 Supp. 3 S.C.C. 217): A 9-judge Constitution Bench upheld the 27% central OBC reservation, holding that social backwardness is the primary criterion for reservation.

State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas (A.I.R. 1976 S.C. 490): The Supreme Court clarified that Articles 16(1) and 16(4) are not mutually antagonistic; rather, Article 16(4) is a mechanism to give real and substantive meaning to the right to equality.

S.V. Joshi v. State of Karnataka (2012) 7 S.C.C. 41): The Supreme Court held that if a State possesses coherent and robust quantifiable data, it can provide reservations exceeding the 50% limit under extraordinary circumstances, much like Tamil Nadu's 69% reservation which has been in place for decades.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues

M. Nagaraj v. Union of India (2006) 8 S.C.C. 212) & Jarnail Singh Case: These cases outlined data collection frameworks, establishing that the Court's role upon finding procedural gaps in data is to direct corrective measures rather than invalidate statutory rights.

9. CONCLUSION

The Madhya Pradesh High Court's judgment of October 9, 2026, in the Ashita Dubey case appears to be a regressive step in the constitutional history of social justice. By prioritizing technical and narrow interpretations while ignoring the ground realities and socio-economic plight of over half the state's population, the Court committed a grave error. Generalizing the entire majority population as affluent based on a few isolated political figures reflects a narrow judicial outlook. With the State Government having filed a Special Leave Petition (SLP) before the Supreme Court, legal experts and justice-loving citizens remain hopeful that the apex court will overturn this flawed verdict, thereby restoring the true spirit of the Constitution and social harmony.

REFERENCES

1. Ashita Dubey & Ors. v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Ors., W.P. No. 5901/2019 (M.P. H.C. Oct. 9, 2026).
2. Indra Sawhney v. Union of India, 1993 Supp. 3 S.C.C. 217.
3. State of Kerala v. N.M. Thomas, A.I.R. 1976 S.C. 490.
4. S.V. Joshi v. State of Karnataka, (2012) 7 S.C.C. 41.
5. M. Nagaraj v. Union of India, (2006) 8 S.C.C. 212.
6. Jarnail Singh v. Lachhmi Narain Gupta, (2018) 10 S.C.C. 396.
7. Government of India, Report of the Backward Classes Commission (Mandal Commission), New Delhi (1980).
8. Government of Madhya Pradesh, The Madhya Pradesh Public Services (Reservation for Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes and Other Backward Classes) Amendment Act, 2019.
9. Dr. Bhimrao Ambedkar University of Social Sciences (BRAUSS), Empirical Survey Report on Backward Classes in Madhya Pradesh, Mhow (2023).
10. Constitution of India, 1950, arts. 15(4), 16(4), 17, 340.

Indian Journal of Contemporary Legal and Social Issues