



सत्यमेव जयते

न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF 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.: 16286/1031/2025

In the matter of:

Complainant:

Rajesh Singh

Respondent:

The Director,
National Institute for the Empowerment of Persons with Visual Disabilities
(NIEPVD),
Dehradun, Uttarakhand

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Hearing: A personal hearing in the hybrid mode in the matter was conducted by the Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities on 24.11.2025. The following were present during the hearing:

Sl. No.	Name & Designation of the Attendees	On behalf of	Mode of Presence
1.	Shri Rajesh Singh	Complainant	Online
2.	Dr. Vinod Kumar Kain, Head of Department, Special Education, NIEPVD	Respondent	Online

2. Proceedings during the hearing:

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Rajesh Singh, a person with visual impairment, alleged that despite meeting the eligibility criteria and registering during the open round counseling for admission to the D.Ed. Special Education (Visual Impairment) course at NIEPVD, his name was omitted from the merit list dated 17th and 22nd September 2025. He further submitted that on 4th October 2025, he registered on time but faced technical issues causing a delay, and upon returning on 6th October 2025, his name appeared in the initial list but was excluded from the revised list, while candidates with lower marks, including non-PwD candidates, were admitted.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by Dr. Vinod Kumar Kain, submitted that a written reply dated 4th November 2025 had been filed with the Court. He explained that the open round counseling was conducted from 4th to 6th October 2025 via the Rehabilitation Council of India (RCI) portal, with registrations accepted until 11:00 AM on 6th October 2025 to manage the process efficiently, as over 35,000 candidates were eligible for the limited seats. The merit list was prepared based on marks and time of reporting, with three candidates scoring 78.2%: Shivani (non-PwD, reported before 11:00 AM), Priyanka (non-PwD, reported before 11:00 AM), and the Complainant (PwD, reported at 12:30 PM). Admission was granted to Shivani on merit due to earlier reporting.

2.3 The Respondent clarified that the institute follows RCI guidelines for centralized admissions, requiring prior RCI portal registration. The total sanctioned seats are 35, plus 3 for EWS, making 38 seats, with reservations as per Government of India norms, including approximately 4-5% for PwBDs under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPwD Act). However, in practice, 16 seats (about 45%) were allotted to visually impaired students in the current session.

2.4 The Court questioned the arbitrary 11:00 AM cutoff on 6th October 2025, the lack of prior notification or communication of any time limit for registration, and whether the process adhered to merit-based principles or devolved into a "first-come, first-served" approach, potentially discriminating against PwBD candidates who may face accessibility barriers. He noted that continuing registrations beyond 11:00 AM while excluding later registrants like the Complainant, raised concerns about procedural fairness, especially when higher-merit candidates (e.g., 87% or 82.2%) approached later on the same day but were not considered.

2.5 The Respondent submitted that no specific rule mandates a fixed time limit, but the cutoff was necessary for practical reasons to prepare the merit list and complete admissions within the open round timeframe, as the RCI

portal was not fully operational, and over 40 candidates had registered by 11:00 AM. He assured that all admissions were merit-based within categories and that classes had commenced with all 38 seats filled.

2.6 The Court questioned the Respondent's policy of registration, inquiring whether the candidates were informed about the closure of registration at 11:00 AM. The Court observed that the whole process undertaken by the Respondent smacks of arbitrariness, particularly regarding the lack of notified timelines, potential violation of merit principles, etc.

2.7 Accordingly, the Respondent was asked to furnish clarifications on the above observation. The case will next be heard on 13.01.2026.

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



09.01.2026

(P. P. Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner