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.ccpd.nic.in

Case No. 13205/1102/2022

In the matter of -

Shri Rahul Bajaj **...Complainant**

Versus

The Director,
Practo Technologies Pvt. Ltd. [PTPL]
3rd Floor, Salarpuria Symbiosis, Arekere,
Bannerghatta Main Road,
Bangalore-560076 (Karnataka)
Email: sid@practo.com **...Respondent No.1**

The Director General of Health Services (DGHS),
Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,
Government of India,
Nirman Bhawan, New Delhi -110001
Email: sandhya.k@nic.in **...Respondent No.2**

The Secretary,
Ministry of Information & Broadcasting,
Room No 552, A wing Shastri Bhawan,
New Delhi-110001
Email: secy.inb@nic.in **...Respondent No.3**

RECORD OF PROCEEDING

1. Hearing (VI): A hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on **12.12.2025**. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl. No.	Name and Designation of the Party/Representative	Parties	Mode

1.	Ms. Anchal Bhatheja (Counsel for the Complainant)	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Jagannath Nanda (Counsel for Respondent No.1)	Respondent No.1	Online
3.	Dr. Rupali Roy Representative DGHS	Respondent No.2	Online
4.	Sh.Pawan Kumar Senior Director, NIC, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting	Respondent No.3	Online
5.	Ms. Aprajita, Joint Director, Ministry of Information & Broadcasting	Respondent No.3	Online

2. Proceedings of the hearing:

2 . 1 At the outset, Counsel for Respondent No. 1, Mr. Jagannath Nanda, submitted that compliance stood at approximately **60–70%**, requiring further technical guidance. Respondent informed the Court that they had adopted **Figma (Version 4)** to work towards accessibility compliance across approximately **250 identified pages**.

2.2 Counsel for the Complainant, Ms. Anchal Bhatheja, objected to reliance on Figma, submitting that it was **not a statutorily recognized or authoritative tool** for accessibility assessment. She reiterated the request for a certified third-party audit in accordance with **Section 40** of the RPwD Act and **BIS IS 17802**, stating that anything less would be unacceptable.

2.3 The Court observed that Respondent No. 1 was repeatedly projecting efforts without completing statutory compliance. The Court clarified that no auditor or panel had been mandated and that delays could not be attributed to non-contact with suggested auditors. Finding misuse of the Court’s indulgence, the Court declined to accept the explanations on record.

2.4 The Court also noted that the deadline of **10 May 2025** had

expired; the Court directed that on the **next date of hearing i.e., 19.12.2025**, the **concerned technical officer/authority of the Respondent** No. 1 shall appear in person, and clarified that **no further submissions from counsel** would be entertained at that stage. The Complainant and Respondents Nos. 2 & 3 may join through their representatives.

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

Digitally signed by
Praveen Prakash Ambashta
Date: 17-12-2025 10:55:54

(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)
Deputy Chief Commissioner