



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/14155/1012/2023

In the matter of:

**Ms. Komal
Complainant**

...

Versus

**The Secretary,
Staff Selection Commission (SSC),
New Delhi
Respondent No. 1**

...

**The Principal Chief Commissioner of Income Tax,
Chennai
Respondent No. 2**

...

**The Principal DGIT (HRD), CBDT
No. 3** ... **Respondent**

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 Ms. Komal, a person with **100% visual impairment**, filed a complaint dated **05.06.2023** alleging that she had been allotted the **Southern Region** for appointment as **Tax Assistant (CGLE-2021)** despite being eligible for posting in the **Northern Region**, where she resides. She asserted that candidates with disabilities ought to be allotted their **home zone**, and that the present allotment caused undue hardship to her and her widowed mother, her only family support.

1.2 Notices were issued to the Respondents under Sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act. SSC (Respondent No. 1) and the Income Tax Department (Respondent No. 2) filed replies stating that zone allocation

is undertaken centrally by CBDT (Respondent No. 3). Respondent No. 3, after being impleaded, did not file any reply.

1.3 Accordingly, a hearing was scheduled in the case on 03.04.2025.

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 At the hearing held on **04.04.2025**, the Complainant failed to appear, but contacted the Court telephonically and stated that she wished to **withdraw** the complaint. She also indicated that she had **resigned** from the Income Tax Department and subsequently joined the Railways.

2.2 The Court directed the Complainant to confirm her withdrawal by email within one hour. No such communication was received despite repeated attempts by the CCPD Office to contact her. Respondents confirmed that they were aware of her resignation.

2.3 A second hearing in the evening of the same day was attended by SSC (Respondent No. 1), which reiterated that SSC has **no role in zone allocation**, which is exclusively the domain of CBDT.

3. Observations and Recommendations

3.1 In the absence of any written confirmation from the Complainant regarding withdrawal, and given her non-appearance and non-communication despite specific directions of the Court, the complaint **cannot proceed further**. The case is therefore liable to be dismissed for **default of appearance**, without adjudication on merits.

3.2 Since the Complainant has neither appeared nor expressed willingness to pursue the matter, and given her resignation from the concerned department, no further directions are required.

4. The complaint is **dismissed for default of appearance**, with no adjudication on merits.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities