



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  
 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, N.I.S.D. Bhawan, G-2, Sector-10, Dwarka, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364  
 Email: [ccpd@nic.in](mailto:ccpd@nic.in); Website: [www.ccdisabilities.nic.in](http://www.ccdisabilities.nic.in)

**Case no. CCPD/14587/1011/2023**

**In the matter of**

Dr. Syed Mohammed Ali Badruddin

**...Complainant**

**Versus**

The Registrar,  
 Aligarh Muslim University,  
 Aligarh (U.P.)

**...Respondent**

### RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

**1. Hearing:**

1.1 A hearing in hybrid mode(offline/online) was conducted on **13.05.2025**. The following parties/ representatives were present during the hearing:

S.No.	Name and designation of the Party/Representative	For Complainant or Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Syed Mohammed Ali Badruddin - Complainant	Complainant	Physical
2.	Professor M. Parvez - Aligarh Muslim University (OSD Selection Committee)	Respondent	Online
3.	Mr. Ataullah Khan - Secretary In-charge, Selection Committee	Respondent	Online

## 2. Record of Proceedings:

2.1 The Respondent submitted that he is a teaching faculty member holding an additional charge as OSD for the Selection Committee, and was appearing on behalf of the Registrar. The Commission noted that, ideally, a representative from the administrative side, well-versed with reservation rosters, should have appeared, but permitted the Respondent to present the case.

2.2 The Court recorded that the present matter relates to the complaint of Dr. Sayed Mohammed Ali regarding the non-consideration of his candidature under the reserved category for persons with disabilities against an advertisement issued in 2022 for the post of Associate Professor in the Department of Zoology at AMU.

2.3 The Court also noted that the case was first taken up with AMU on 2nd November 2023, with reminders sent on 04.12.2023 and 01.03.2024. A reply was received from AMU on 16.12.2023.

2.4 The Complainant submitted that he possessed the requisite qualifications and experience, and that his service as Research Associate ought to have been considered as equivalent to the post of Assistant Professor, in terms of *UGC Regulations, 2018*.

2.5 The Respondent, however, contended that the certificates furnished by the complainant were self-attested and not issued by the Registrar/competent authority. Essential details such as salary drawn, scale of pay, and mode of appointment were also missing. It was further submitted that, as per *UGC Regulations, 2018*, only past service rendered in equivalent positions with proper selection process and prescribed qualifications could be counted.

2.6 The Court referred to the advertisement of 2022, which clearly stipulated under Clause 3:

*“A minimum of eight years of experience of teaching and/or research in an academic/research position equivalent to that of Assistant Professor in a University, College, or accredited Institution/Industry, with at least seven publications in peer-reviewed or UGC-listed journals and a total research score of*

*seventy-five, as per Appendix II."*

2.7 It was observed that the advertisement also required the experience certificate to be issued by the Registrar of the concerned University or by the General Manager in case of industry. Certificates issued by other authorities, such as the Head of Department, Dean, or Principal, were not to be considered valid.

2.8 The Respondent clarified that while relaxations for persons with disabilities may be provided in terms of marks, attempts, or age, no relaxation can be granted in the eligibility criteria.

2.9 The Court observed that the jurisdiction of this Commission is confined to issues concerning rights of PWDs under the RPwD Act, 2016, including reservation and non-discrimination, and does not extend to adjudicating upon general eligibility requirements prescribed under *UGC Regulations, 2018*.

2.10 The Court further observed that it does not find any discrimination on the grounds of disability against the Complainant.

2.11 The Respondent assured that the post in question continues to remain reserved for the PWD category and has not been filled.

2.12 Accordingly, the Complainant was directed to submit, within three days from the date of receipt of this Record of proceedings, a further representation explaining his locus standi. Based on the same further course of action would be taken by the Court.

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

**(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)**  
**Deputy Chief Commissioner**