



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: 13979/1023/2023

In the matter of—

Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh

...Complainant

Versus

The Chairman & Managing Director, Punjab National Bank. **...Respondent 1**

The Chairman, Institute of Banking Personnel Selection. **...Respondent 2**

1. Hearing:

1.1 A hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 25.06.2025.
 The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/ Representatives	For Complainant/ Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Ajay Kumar Singh	Complainant	Online
2.	Adv. Rishabh Sharma	Complainant	Online
3.	Mr. Amrendra Kumar, GM HRD, PNB HQ	Respondent No. 1	Online
4.	Mr. Animutyalu, DGM, IBPS	Respondent No. 2	Online

2. Record Of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant alleged that during an official visit by Circle Head Shri Deepak Kumar Srivastava, he observed the Complainant's physical condition and questioned the manner in which he was standing. Upon being informed of the Complainant's disability, Shri Srivastava allegedly made insensitive and derogatory remarks in the presence of other staff members.

2.2 In response, the Respondent No. 1 stated that Mrs. P. Dhanlaxmi, the second senior-most official at the branch, was questioned regarding the incident. She denied that any such remarks were made. Similarly, Shri Sushil Kumar Rajak, who was serving as the Branch Head then, confirmed that the Circle Head's interaction comprised general inquiries and no discriminatory or inappropriate comments were made regarding the Complainant's disability.

2.3 The Court enquired whether the Complainant was aware of the enquiry proceedings conducted by the Respondent. The Complainant stated that three witnesses were present during the incident and were available during the internal enquiry. However, the enquiry officer only questioned two female employees, focusing more on the delay in filing the complaint rather than investigating the substance of the allegation. Importantly, the Complainant pointed out that Shri Satish Kumar, the third witness, whose presence during the incident was officially acknowledged by both Shri Rajak and Mrs. Dhanlaxmi, was not examined during the enquiry process.

2.4 After hearing both parties, the Court raised concerns about the adequacy and propriety of the inquiry conducted by the Respondent No. 1. It specifically questioned whether the statements had been formally recorded in writing, and noted that in the absence of properly documented evidence, such findings cannot be treated as conclusive. The Court expressed dissatisfaction with the inquiry, noting that it was not conducted in a fair or appropriate manner.

2.5 Accordingly, the Court recommended that the Respondent No.1 initiate a fresh enquiry at a higher level and constitute a committee for this purpose. The names of the committee members must be shared with both the Court and the Complainant within seven days. The statements of the Complainant and all persons present at the time of the alleged incident must be recorded. The inquiry report shall be submitted within 30 days. Upon receipt of the committee composition and the Inquiry Report, this Court will issue further recommendations.

3. This is issued with the approval of the Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities.

(P. P Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner