



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-14055/1024/2023

In the matter of —

Shri Inderjeet Singh

...Complainant

Versus

The Chief Executive Officer

Prasar Bharti, Prasar Bharti Secretariat,

New Delhi

...Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr. Inderjeet Singh, the Complainant, who is 100% visually impaired, filed a complaint dated 12.04.2023 regarding the non-payment of his Central Government Employees Group Insurance Scheme (CGEGIS) amount and Leave Encashment following his retirement on 31.07.2022. He reported that while his General Provident Fund (GPF) was received after a 3.5-month delay, it is not considered part of his pensionary benefits. Mr. Singh further alleged that the one-month delay in forwarding his service book after retirement constituted harassment by departmental officials, specifically naming Mr. Haresh Patsariya, the then Assistant Divisional Officer (ADO). He also claimed an undue delay in releasing his Gratuity and Commutation. Additionally, Mr. Singh asserted that he has not yet received his Leave Encashment, attributing this to an intentional error in the authority letter that the then Central President, Shri Hari Om Meena, issued. Consequently, Mr. Singh holds both Mr. Patsariya and Mr. Meena responsible for the difficulties he has faced. He seeks immediate payment of all pending dues, compensation for mental and financial distress, and appropriate disciplinary action against the officers concerned.

2. Notice issued to the Respondent:

2.1. A notice dated 26.05.2023 was issued by this Court under Sections 75 and 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016(hereinafter referred to as “the RPWD Act”), directing the Respondent to furnish their comments on the complaint and place on record supporting documents and justifications, if any.

3. Reply filed by the Respondent:

3.1. In the response dated 07.08.2023, the Respondent acknowledged the non-payment of terminal benefits raised by the complainant after his retirement. The Respondent stated that the Retirement Gratuity, Commuted Value of Pension, and Leave Encashment have been paid to the complainant. Only the payments related to the Central Government Employees Group Insurance Scheme (CGEGIS) and Transfer Travelling Allowance (TA) Claim Bill remain pending, which are relatively minor amounts. The Respondent requested 45 days to release these remaining claims and undertook to submit an Action Taken Report thereafter.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

4.1. In his rejoinder dated 04.09.2023, the Complainant asserted that Akashvani, Kota had unjustly withheld his Transfer Travelling Allowance (TA) Bill. He reiterated that his General Provident Fund (GPF) was released after a delay of 3.5 months; Pension after 7 months; Commutation and Gratuity after 8 months; Leave Encashment after 10 months; and CGEGIS after one year from his retirement. The Complainant also annexed a copy of the RTI response concerning the status of his pension payment. He prayed for compensation for financial hardship caused by these delays and requested that interest be paid on the delayed Commutation amount.

5. Hearing:

A hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 07.04.2025. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

S. No.	Name and designation of the Party/Representative	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of attendance
1.	Mr. Inderjeet Singh – Complainant	Complainant	Online
2.			

---	Mr. Lokesh Kumar, Deputy Director General, Akashvani, Jaipur	Respondent	Online
3.	Mr. B. Kerketta, Deputy Director General	Respondent	Online

6. Record of Proceedings:

6.1. The Complainant reiterated the facts of the case and restated the contentions made in both his original complaint and rejoinder.

6.2 In response to a query by the Court, the Respondent confirmed that the organisation is governed by the Central Civil Services (Pension) Rules, 2021 and instructions issued by the DoPT on the subject, including their Office Memorandum dated 05.10.1999, according to which, any delay in GPF payment beyond three months requires interest to be paid. The Respondent acknowledged the delays, attributing them to procedural requirements such as vigilance clearance and approval of the Pension Payment Order (PPO) from the Delhi office. Regarding the Transfer Allowance (TA) and Composite Transfer Grant, the Court inquired about the status of these payments, as the Complainant alleged they had not been fully paid. The Respondent explained that the Complainant's initial application faced objections at the local station, prompting a revised request without transportation charges, and that final payment was made on 01.12.2023.

7. Observations and Recommendations:

7.1. At the outset, the Court observed that the subject matter of the case relates to the service conditions of the Complainant. As such, it would have been appropriate that the matters were dealt with by the Grievance Redressal Officer of the Respondent, whose appointment in every establishment is a statutory mandate under Section 23 of the RPwD Act, 2016. After exhausting that remedy, the Complainant was supposed to approach the Hon'ble CAT. However, considering the lapse of time in these proceedings, and the facts that- (a) the Complainant is a retired official with 100% visual impairment, which might have prevented him from following up on his pending dues with the officers concerned, and (b) the Respondent's acknowledgement of the delay and cooperation in the proceedings, this Court concludes that it will be expedient for it to issue necessary recommendation in the matter.

7.2 This Court observes that there is apparent negligence in adhering to time limits for disbursal of post-retirement benefits. The substantial delays in processing payments to the Complainant, a person with disability acquired in service, constitute a serious lapse. Such delay amounts to mental harassment, especially

considering the vulnerable state of a retiring employee, who is often managing several physical, emotional, and financial challenges. Partial or delayed payments cannot be justified under any pretext.

7.3 The Respondent is hereby recommended to effect disbursement of all outstanding retirement benefits, if any, within a period of two weeks from the date of this Order. An Action Taken Report be submitted thereafter certifying that no amount remains unpaid to the Complainant.

7.4 In view of the above recommendations, the matter stands disposed of.

(S. Govindraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities