



सत्यमेव जयते

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

Case No. CCPD/14744/1012/2024**In the matter of —**

Shri Charles A B

... Complainant**Versus**The Director,
Vikram Sarabhai Space Centre**... Respondent****1. Gist of the Case:**

1.1 Mr. Charles A B, an 80% visually impaired candidate from Thrissur, Kerala, filed a complaint on 01.01.2024 against ISRO, alleging denial of relaxation in qualifying marks for PwD candidates in Assistant/UDC recruitment. He failed to clear the 40% cutoff in the 2023 written exam and, in a previous 2018 recruitment, scored 57% in the skill test—below the then-required 60% cutoff. Charles argues that under the revised 2022 notification and DoPT guidelines, the skill test cutoff for PwD was reduced to 40%, and these relaxations should have been applied retrospectively or his earlier performance considered, but ISRO did not do so, leading to his non-selection. He requests relaxation in qualifying marks as per the latest norms, consideration of his 2018 skill test score for 2022 vacancies, and prompt appointment action.

2. Notice issued to the Respondents:

2.1 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 23.01.2024 was issued to the above-mentioned respondents for forwarding to this Court comments on affidavit on the complaint within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply filed by the Respondent:

3.1 Respondent No.1: Reply received on 08.02.2024, stating that the complainant did not pass the 2023 written test (below 40% marks), previous 2018 scores cannot be carried over to 2022 notification, different norms applied to 2017 and. 2022 recruitments, and no violations of RPwD Act or guidelines occurred.

4. Notice to Complainant for Rejoinder:

4.1 A copy of the reply filed by Respondent was forwarded to the Complainant vide letter dated 22.02.2024 for filing his rejoinder within 15 days.

5. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

5.1 Rejoinder filed on 22.02.2024, reiterating the request for relaxation under the 2022 notification and DoPT OM dated 15.01.2018, arguing that revised norms should apply due to organisational changes and successes in space missions, and enclosing the 2022 advertisement for reference.

6. Hearings:

6.1 The Case was initially scheduled for a hearing on 03.06.2025, but the same could not take place as the Complainant could not join, despite intra-day adjournments. The case was again scheduled for a hearing in hybrid mode (offline/online) on 31.07.2025. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the Parties/Representatives	For Complainant / Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Charles A.B.	Complainant	Online
2.	Advocate C.J. Joveson	Counsel for the Complainant	Online
3.	Mr. Raveendran R.,	For Respondent	Online

	Sr. Head, PGA, ISRO HQ		
--	------------------------	--	--

7. Record of Proceedings

7.1 At the outset, the Court was briefed on the case facts. The Complainant reiterated his written submission. The Court asked the Respondent to provide (i) the total vacancies advertised in 2018 and the number reserved for persons with disabilities, and (ii) whether any relaxation in cut-off marks under para 11 of DoP&T O.M. dated 15.01.2018 was given to PwD candidates.

7.2 The Respondent stated that 89 vacancies were advertised, seven reserved for PwDs. Of 18 PwD candidates shortlisted for the skill test, 11 qualified with the 60-mark cut-off; as 11 candidates qualified for appointment against 7 vacancies, further relaxation was deemed unnecessary.

7.3 The Complainant’s counsel requested a uniform cut-off across recruitment years, emphasising that recruitment rule changes should align with the RPwD Act’s inclusion and reasonable accommodation ideals. However, he could not clearly establish a grievance regarding any specific provision in the 2022 rule modification or its impact.

7.4 In response, the Respondent stated that the modified rules now provide relaxation in the cut-off for all disadvantaged groups, including PwDs, making them more beneficial than the previous rules.

7 Observation & Recommendation:

7.1 Upon hearing both parties and reviewing the case records, this Court concludes that the Complainant has failed to establish a prima facie case of violation of any provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016, or any rules or instructions issued in pursuance thereof, or denial of any rights vested in the Complainant as a person with disabilities, or any discrimination on the grounds of disability.

7.2 This case is accordingly disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities