



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.ccdisabilities.nic.in

Case no. CCPD/14439/1012/2023

In the matter of:

Complainant

Md. Rais (F/o Mohammad Saqib)

Versus

Respondent

The Secretary,

Staff Selection Commission (SSC HO)

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Hearing:

1.1. A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 19.11.2025, wherein the following parties/representatives were present :

S. No.	Name and designation of the Attendees	On Behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Md. Rais F/o Mohammad Saqib	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Prakash Halder – US SSC NR	Respondent	Online

--	--	--	--

2. Proceedings During the Hearing:

2.1 Md. Rais, the father of Mohammad Saqib, a person with locomotor disability, filed a complaint on behalf of his son. He submitted that his son cleared Tier-I of the SSC CHSL Examination held on 15.03.2023 and was therefore eligible to appear in Tier-II, which was held on 26.06.2023. He submitted that they had produced the Typing Exemption Certificate in Shift-I (Morning) on the day of Tier-II examination, where the examination staff informed them that the documents had been duly taken on record and that they were not required to appear in Shift-II. As a measure of abundant caution, they also sent the relevant documents to SSC by email the very next day. However, the result did not reflect the typing exemption. Despite repeated representations and complaints to the SSC, no relief was granted.

2.2 The Court had sought an explanation from the Respondent regarding non-responsiveness towards the Complainant's grievance and Notice & Reminder notice issued by the Court.

2.3 The Respondent submitted that candidates were required to appear in person in Shift-II to seek exemption from the typing test.

2.4 The Complainant submitted that all relevant documents were produced in person during Shift-I (Morning), and that the examination staff expressly instructed them not to appear in Shift-II (Afternoon).

2.5 The Court prima facie observed that the Respondent did not issue clear and proper instructions to its staff at the examination centre. It also observed that the Respondent failed to respond to the Complainant's emails and grievances, resulting in avoidable delay in grievance redressal. The denial of employment opportunity to persons with disabilities on such grounds is not only violative of the RPwD Act, but also of their fundamental right to equal opportunity in the matter of employment and appointment within the state as enshrined in Article 16 (1) of the Constitution of India.

2.6 The Court suggested that the Respondent place on record the marks secured by the Complainant's son and the applicable cut-off. Further, the Respondents must clarify whether he would have qualified for the examination had

the typing exemption been duly considered. In the event the Complainant's son is found to have secured the requisite marks and is otherwise eligible for appointment, the Respondent needs to work out a proposal for appropriate remedial measures.

2.7 The Respondent shall submit the above information along with relevant documents within 15 days, with a copy to the Complainant, who shall be allowed a further period of 7 days for a rejoinder, if any.

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

(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)
Dy Chief Commissioner