



न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF THE CHIEF COMMISSIONER FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES (DIVYANGJAN)

दिव्यांगजन सशक्तिकरण विभाग/Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan)

सामाजिक न्याय और अधिकारिता मंत्रालय/Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment

भारत सरकार/Government of India

5वाँ तल, एन.आई.एस.डी. भवन, जी-2, सेक्टर-10, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली-110075; दूरभाष : (011) 20892364

5th Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364

Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in

In the matter of —

Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma

... Complainant

Versus

(1) The Director,
Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli **...Respondent No. 1**

(2) The Secretary,
Department of Higher Education
Ministry of Education **... Respondent No.2**

(3) The Managing Director and CEO,
Central Bank of India **... Respondent No.3**

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma, a person with 40% Locomotor Disability (OL) filed a Complaint dated 16.07.2024 regarding the denial of his admission to PGPM (2024-26) by the Indian Institute of Management Tiruchirappalli (IIM Trichy).

1.2 The Complainant submitted that he was a student in IIM Trichy. He alleged as under:

(a) He was thrown out of the hostel and the Institute because of non-deposition of full fees, while a loan under Vidya Lakshmi Scheme (Loan ID No. 2520994) was about to be sanctioned from the Central Bank of India

(IFSC Code CBIN0280900, Tiruchirapalli).

(b) An application was made to be written to him by pressurizing him wherein there is no matching of signature, and he was insulted so much by making fun of his poverty.

1.3 He prayed that IIM Trichy be directed to offer him provisional admission in the PGPM-2024-26.

2. Notice issued to the Respondents:

In exercise of the powers conferred u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 [hereinafter referred to as "the Act"], a notice dated 23.07.2024 was issued to the respondents for forwarding to this Court comments on affidavit on the complaint within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply filed by the Respondents:

3.1 The Director, IIM Trichy [Respondent No.1] filed its reply on affidavit dated 22.08.2024 and inter-alia submitted that Mr. Rahul Kumar Sharma [Complainant] was waitlisted in the PGPM on 10.05.2024. He paid the waitlist commitment fee of ₹20,000/- on 14.05.2024. Based on the waitlist movement, he was provided an admission offer for PGPM on 3 June 2024. For that round of offers, the last date for the payment of the offer acceptance fee was 07.06.2024 by 5:00 pm, and the last date for the payment of the remaining first term fee was 15.06.2024 by 5:00 pm.

3.2 The Complainant claimed that he had paid the offer commitment fee of ₹80,000/- through a bank loan obtained from the Central Bank of India. The admission office cross-checked the payment transaction and the following observations were found:

(a) The last date of the offer acceptance fee was 07.06.2024, but the payment details provided by the Complainant affirmed the date to be 14.05.2024. As per the Admissions portal, the offer commitment fee for the waitlisted candidate will only be active upon providing an offer to the candidate. The Complainant was provided an offer only on 03.06.2024 and the payment date could not be before 03.06.2024. Hence, his claim that he had paid the offer acceptance fee of ₹80,000/- on 14.05.2024 was false and he had submitted a fake fee detail.

(b) The transaction reference number (0885579730519) that he had provided towards the offer acceptance fee of ₹80,000/- is nothing but the

same transaction number that he paid towards the waitlist fee of ₹20,000/- on 14.05.2024. He had also generated a fake acceptance offer letter and submitted fake details twice to the institute that he had paid ₹1,00,000/-. This is an offence that could not be justified under the law of the land.

(c) Due to the fake claim and discrepancies in the payment, the offer was forfeited.

3.2 No reply was received from Respondent No.2 and Respondent No.3.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant filed his rejoinder dated 06.09.2024 and reiterated his complaint that he had a few difficulties due to his poverty that were hindering him from completing his degree and that He was punished for a mistake that was beyond his control.

5. Hearing:

A hearing was conducted on **08.01.2025 in hybrid mode** (offline/online through video conferencing). The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl. No.	Name of the parties/ Representatives	Mode of Presence
From Complainant:		
1.	Mr Rahul Kumar Sharma, Complainant	Online
From Respondent No.1:		
1.	Mr Prabhakar Mishra, Legal Counsel	Online
2.	Mr K. Muttukamaran	Online
3.	Mr Vipin Chairperson (Admission)	Online
From Respondent No.2:		
	None appeared	---
From Respondent No.3:		
1.	Mr Vivek Kumar, General Manager, Corporate Office, Bank of India	Online

2.	Mr Sasnidharan, Zonal Manager, Bank of India, Chennai	Online
3.	Mr. Sanjay, Officer	Online

6. Observations & Recommendations:

6.1 Both the parties were heard.

6.2 The Complainant and Respondent No. 1 stuck to the stand taken by them in their written submissions. Respondent No. 3 mentioned that they had sanctioned the loan to meet the expenditure on admission fees on 11.06.2024, which is after the last date for submission of the fees. Respondent No. 3 also submitted that multiple efforts to contact the Complainant on phone and through WhatsApp did not yield any result. It was observed that the Complainant had submitted fake details/documents to the institute to show that he had paid the requisite fee of ₹1,00,000/-. Such an offence is not justifiable under the law of the land, under any circumstances. The Complainant could have talked to the authorities of the Respondent Institute for the grant of more time as he had applied for a loan instead of submitting fake documents to the Institute. At the time of hearing this matter, the admission process has been completed, and no direction can be issued for admission of the Complainant. Hence, there appears no merit in the Complaint.

6.3 Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(Rajesh Aggarwal)
Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities