



## 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.ccpd.nic.in](http://www.ccpd.nic.in)

**Case No.: 14417/1101/2023**

**In the matter of:**

Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini

**... Complainant**

**versus**

The Joint Secretary & Law Officer,  
Law Commission of India

**... Respondent**

### **1. Gist of the Complaint**

1.1 The Complainant, a person with **48% intellectual disability**, filed a complaint dated **16.08.2023** alleging violation of **Section 42** of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 ("the Act") by the **Law Commission of India (LCI)**. Section 42 mandates that all audio, print, and electronic content be made available in **accessible formats**, including screen-reader compatibility.

1.2 The Complainant further relied on **Rule 15 (1) (c) (ii)** of the RPwD Rules, 2017, which requires all establishments to comply with the **Guidelines for Indian Government Websites (GIGW)**, ensuring accessibility of all ICT content.

1.3 The Complainant prayed for directions to LCI to:

- (a) use disabled-friendly text formats and convert all LCI reports into **OCR-enabled, screen-reader-friendly formats**;
- (b) ensure compliance with Rule 15(1)(c)(ii) by converting all PDFs into accessible formats;
- (c) upload only OCR-enabled documents in the future; and
- (d) apply for **STQC-GIGW certification**, the mandatory benchmark for Government websites.

## **2. Notice Issued to the Respondent**

2.1 In exercise of powers under **Sections 75 and 77** of the Act, a notice dated **23.08.2023** was issued to the Respondent requiring filing of comments on affidavit within 30 days, along with supporting documents.

## **3. Reply Filed by the Respondent**

3.1 The Respondent, vide reply dated **01.12.2023**, submitted that older LCI reports (1st to 169th) were **archival, fragile, and large**, making OCR conversion difficult. However, reports from the **170th to 283rd** were already under conversion in collaboration with **NIC**, and most reports of the current Law Commission were available in OCR format.

3.2 It was admitted that a few reports highlighted by the Complainant (e.g., 235th, 264th, 278th) had been inadvertently uploaded in non-OCR format, but corrective steps were initiated promptly.

3.3 LCI informed that **STQC certification had been applied for**, but coordination with external agencies required additional time. The Respondent sought **one year** to complete full compliance.

## **4. Rejoinder Filed by the Complainant**

4.1 The Complainant, vide rejoinder dated **23.12.2023**, submitted that even older and voluminous reports could be converted into OCR format using available software. She asserted:

- (a) persons with disabilities have a right to accessible versions of **all** LCI reports;
- (b) reasonable accommodation can be denied only if it imposes an **undue burden** on the establishment;
- (c) fragility or bulk alone is not a valid ground for avoiding OCR conversion;
- (d) she had successfully converted older reports herself, including the **Third Report (Limitation Act, 1908)**, demonstrating feasibility;
- (e) she was willing to volunteer to assist LCI in OCR conversion if provided access to required resources.

## **5. Hearing**

5.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on **04.04.2025**. The following attendees were present:

Sl. No.	Name & Designation	For	Mode
1	Mx. Anushka Priyadarshini	Complainant	Online
2	Shri Raja Kant, Deputy Secretary	Respondent	Online
3	Adv. Vivek Chandra	Counsel for Respondent	Online

## 6. Record of Proceedings

6.1 The Court inquired whether the Complainant's grievance had been redressed, and whether LCI reports had been made OCR-enabled. The Complainant acknowledged improvements but stated that the LCI website **remains insufficiently accessible**, especially for users needing screen-reader-compatible documents.

6.2 The Respondent submitted that most OCR work had been completed, but older reports remained challenging to convert. The Court noted that even the **first document in the Archive section** remained inaccessible, indicating systemic shortcomings.

6.3 On being asked about responsibility for ensuring accessibility, the Respondent stated that NIC uploads reports while other content is uploaded internally. The Court observed that lack of a **formally designated accessibility officer** often leads to inconsistent compliance.

6.4 Given the broader significance of ICT accessibility, the matter was tagged with **Suo Motu Case Nos. 15519/1101/2024 and 15530/1101/2024**, concerning systemic accessibility compliance across Government and private digital platforms.

6.5 The Court directed the Respondent to file an **Action Taken Report (ATR)** within one month outlining steps taken and timelines for full compliance.

## 7. Observations

7.1 **Section 42 of the RPwD Act and Rule 15 of the RPwD Rules, 2017** impose a mandatory duty on all establishments — including LCI — to ensure fully accessible digital content. Accessibility is not discretionary; it is a **statutory right**.

7.2 The Supreme Court in **Vikash Kumar v. UPSC, (2021) 5 SCC 370**, affirmed that accessibility is integral to equality and meaningful participation, and administrative limitations cannot justify denial of reasonable accommodation.

7.3 The Court notes that while LCI has initiated OCR conversion, **completeness and consistency remain lacking**, particularly in older

archival documents. Designation of responsibility and structured workflows are essential for sustained compliance.

## **8. Recommendations**

8.1 In exercise of powers under **Section 75(1)(c)-(d)** of the Act, the Respondent is **recommended** to:

- (a) designate a specific officer/department responsible for ensuring accessibility of all uploaded content;
- (b) complete OCR conversion of all reports, including archival material, prioritising documents most frequently accessed by the public;
- (c) ensure all future uploads are **screen-reader-compatible OCR PDFs**;
- (d) secure **GIGW/STQC certification** at the earliest;
- (e) ensure training of staff in ICT accessibility standards.

8.2 The Respondent shall submit a **comprehensive ATR within one month** from the date of this Order. Failure to furnish the ATR will attract consequences under **Section 93** of the Act (offence of non-furnishing of information).

## **9. Disposal**

9.1 Subject to the above recommendations, the case is **disposed of**. This order is without prejudice to directions issued in the pending Suo Motu cases on digital accessibility.

**(S. Govindaraj)**  
**Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities**