



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.CCPD/14258/1024/2023

In the matter of:

Shri Satveer Ninaniya

...Complainant

VERSUS

The Commissioner,

Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (KVS)

...Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr Satveer Ninaniya, a person with 50 % Locomotor Disability, working as a TGT (English) at KVS, Jharoda Kalan, Delhi, filed a complaint dated 15.06.2023, stating that he met with an accident in December 2017 during school hours. As per the advice of a government hospital, he underwent essential medical tests at a private hospital and paid the expenses.

1.2 Despite multiple written communications to the school administration and KVS RO Delhi, his medical reimbursement of ₹15,800 is pending for over six years. In a departmental Lok Adalat held at Delhi, it was stated that the payment would be made, but no action has been taken so far.

1.3 He alleged inconsistency and discrimination in the reimbursement process at KV, saying that while some employees were paid the whole amount, others received partial payments based on CGHS rates. If the bill is genuine and supported by a government hospital's referral, it should not be delayed or denied. If it is deemed inadmissible, it should be totally and formally rejected with reasons.

2. Notice Issued To The Respondents:

2.1 A notice dated 11.07.2023 was issued to the above-mentioned respondents for forwarding to this Court comments on affidavit on the complaint for violation of Section 20 (1) and (2) within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply filed by the Respondents:

3.1 The Respondents in their reply dated 03.01.2024, stated that Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan (Delhi Region), through letter no. F.19034/2022-23/IA/DR/11835 dated 22.08.2023, has issued an order approving the payment of ₹7,657/- to Shri Satveer Ninania, Ex-TGT (English), KVS Jharoda Kalan, after scrutiny of the total claimed medical bill amounting to ₹15,800.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant filed a rejoinder dated 24.01.2024 that, despite submitting his medical bills in 2017, only a partial payment has been made by KVS after nearly six years of delay. He wishes to clarify that the CGHS facility was not applicable to him during his service tenure. Therefore, he is entitled to reimbursement of the actual amount paid, as per the applicable rules for non-CGHS beneficiaries. He requested that the remaining amount of the medical bill be approved and paid at the earliest.

5. Hearing:

5.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on **10.07.2025**. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

S. No.	Name and Designation of the Attendees	On Behalf of	Mode of attendance
1.	Shri Satveer Ninaniya	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Saurabh Jaitly - Assistant Commissioner, KVS Headquarters.	Respondent	Online

6. Record of Proceedings:

6.1 The Respondent submitted that the matter has been resolved and the full amount of the Complainant's medical bill has been reimbursed, as per the CGHS (Central Government Health Scheme) rates. The Complainant submitted that he has not been reimbursed as per CGHS rates and his claim has been pending for the past 7-8 years.

6.2 The Court observed that the present case relates to a purely

administrative matter and there appears to be no discrimination on the grounds of disability. As such, the issues raised here fall within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Central Administrative Tribunal. However, considering the disadvantage of a person with disability in pursuing this matter with a view to finding a collaborative solution, it agreed to hear the matter.

6.3 The Court sought from the Respondent as to why the Complainant's medical reimbursement was restricted to the CGHS rates, if the CGHS Rules are not applicable in the Respondent's establishment. The Respondent submitted that in cases involving KVS employees, the relevant rules are the Central Civil Services (Medical Attendance) Rules, 1944 (the CSMA Rules), under which the provisions, particularly the reimbursement rates under the CGHS provisions, also apply.

6.4 The Complainant submitted that after his accident, he initially went to a government hospital, which referred him to a private one, because of which the total medical expenses increased.

6.5 In response to a query from the Court, the Respondent confirmed that the total amount could have been reimbursed if it was established that the treatment taken by the Complainant involved a medical emergency.

7. Observations and Recommendations:

7.1 The Court notes that this matter does not fall squarely within its jurisdiction, as it is not directly concerned with the RPWD Act, 2016 or associated standards or rules. However, the Court observes that the Complainant has suffered undue hardship as an employee with a disability in claiming his medical reimbursement. The treatment was necessitated due to an accident, which is apparently a medical emergency. The Respondent is recommended to clear the outstanding dues of the Complainant, aligning with the principle of reasonable accommodation.

7.2 Accordingly, the matter is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities