



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: 14244/1012/2023

In the matter of—

Sh. Mohit Mahajan

...Complainant

Versus

The Controller General of Patents,
Design and Trade Marks

...Respondent No.1

The Secretary,
D/o of Administrative Reforms and Public Grievance **...Respondent No.2**

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Hearing:

1.1 A hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 12.09.2025. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl. No.	Name of the Attendees	On Behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Mohit Mahajan	Complainant	Offline
2.	Dr. Kavita Taunk, Joint Controller of Patents & Designs	Respondent No. 1	Online
3.	Shri Kamal Thakur, Under Secretary, DARPG	Respondent No. 2	Online

2. Proceedings During the Hearing

2.1 At the outset, the Complainant submitted that he faced discrimination during the interview conducted on 11.02.2023 for the post of Consultant advertised by CGPDTM. He further argued that the interview process carried 50 marks, with document verification as per the advertisement. He was the only candidate present for the interview, yet no marks were allotted to him. Instead, the committee declared him "not found suitable" without evaluation. This amounted to discrimination on account of his visual disability. The Complainant also alleged that the respondents cancelled the first interview, re-advertised the post, and even extended the age limit from 60 to 65 years to accommodate another candidate. The entire process was arbitrary, discriminatory, and in violation of disability rights.

2.2 The Respondent submitted that the post of Consultant was a contractual engagement, not a regular recruitment. The position has since been surrendered as there is no longer a requirement. The complainant was considered during the interview, but selection was made solely on merit and not based on disability.

2.3 The Court observed that the complainant was the only shortlisted candidate in the first round. In the subsequent round, another candidate was appointed, but the latter left the position.

2.4 After hearing both parties, the Court noted several discrepancies in the recruitment process. The complainant was the only candidate in the first interview, yet no marks were awarded, and the result was not declared. The process was cancelled without a reasoned justification. A second advertisement was issued without formally concluding the first. The age criteria were altered in the second advertisement, raising concerns of arbitrariness. The Court emphasised that even in contractual recruitment by government agencies, fairness and transparency must be maintained.

2.5 The Court sought written submissions from the respondents on the above-mentioned observations, within 15 days. A copy of their reply shall be endorsed to the Complainant, who will file his rejoinder, if any, within a further period of 7 days.

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

(P. P. Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner