



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/14078/1024/2023

In the matter of:

Satyaveer S Dagur

...Complainant

Versus

The Registrar,

Post Graduate Institute of Medical

Education and Research

...Respondent

1. Hearing:

1.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on **17.04.2025**, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

| S. No. | Name and Designation of the Attendees | On Behalf of | Mode of Attendance |
|--------|--|--------------|--------------------|
| 1. | Mr. Satyaveer Dagur | Complainant | Online |
| 2. | Mr. Ghanshyam Das Sharma, Senior Admin Office | Respondent | Online |

2. Proceedings during the Hearing:

2.1 The Complainant introduced himself as President of the "PGI Differently Abled Employees Union" and stated that the complaint

relates to facilities/rights of persons with disabilities in PGIMER, particularly concerning residential accommodation and accessibility. He stated that around 120 PwD employees are working in PGIMER and alleged that:

- (a) Accessible residential accommodation is not available.
- (b) There is no lift/ramp in multiple residential blocks.
- (c) Ground-floor accommodation is being denied; and
- (d) Despite meetings with the administration, no final decision has been taken.

2.2 The Court sought clarification as to whether the Complainant is an “aggrieved person” directly affected. The Complainant stated that he is a person with disability—orthopaedic disability, lower limb (right leg), 48%—and is representing affected PwD employees. The Court noted that disability particulars were not clearly reflected in the record and indicated that supporting details/documents be furnished.

2.3 On a query from the Court regarding whether the situation remains the same since the complaint was filed, the Complainant submitted that no effective resolution has occurred; a subcommittee was stated to have completed proceedings/minutes, but implementation has not taken place.

2.4 The Court advised that the issues raised were broad and directed that the matter be narrowed down. The Complainant stated that he wishes to pursue residential accommodation/accessibility in the present proceedings.

2.5 The Respondent submitted that after receipt of the complaint, a subcommittee was constituted and recommendations were discussed. It was stated that, to provide reservation/out-of-turn allotment to PwDs within housing, the PGIMER housing allotment rules need to be amended. The Respondent submitted that:

- (a) Housing allotment rules were last amended in 2016;
- (b) A committee for review of the existing rules has been formed, and the Complainant is also a member.
- (c) A total of 23 rules under review; the process is in progress

through successive meetings.

(d) Presently, there exists a 5% “special discretion/out-of-turn” allotment category (not exclusively for PwDs, but also for health issues etc.), wherein PwDs are included; and

(e) Once finalized, the proposed amendments will be placed before the Governing Body.

2.6 The Court enquired about the Governing Body meeting schedule and timelines. The Respondent stated that the Governing Body met on 26.02.2025 and generally meets quarterly. On timelines for completion, the Respondent expressed difficulty in committing to one month and sought six months’ time.

2.7 The Court observed that the complaint has been pending for a considerable time, and it cannot be delayed indefinitely. The Commissioner indicated that the Institute should be prepared to place the matter before the next Governing Body meeting and should avoid undue delay, as the committee process is within institutional control.

2.8 The Complainant disputed certain dates/claims made by the Respondent and submitted that:

(a) The subcommittee was created in November 2022; a meeting was held on 25.01.2023.

(b) Minutes were placed before the housing allotment committee on 28.04.2023 with an indication that the agenda would be placed in the next meeting.

(c) Thereafter, the agenda was not placed again; and

(d) The amendment committee’s last meeting was in December 2023.

3. Interim Recommendations:

3.1 After hearing both sides, the Court issued the following interim recommendations:

(a) For the Complainant: The Complainant shall submit to this Court within 15 days a list of aggrieved PwD employees affected by the issue (i.e., those not provided accommodation as per due

reservation/appropriate allotment/ground floor/accessibility needs), with necessary particulars including their disability certificates.

(b) For the Respondent: The Respondent shall submit an Action Taken Report (ATR) within 15 days detailing:

- (i) Constitution of subcommittee(s);
- (ii) Dates of meetings held;
- (iii) Current status of deliberations; and
- (iv) Present position regarding proposed amendments and accommodation measures.

(c) Timeline for institutional action: The Respondent was advised to complete the subcommittee's recommendation process within a timeframe of six (6) weeks and be prepared to place the matter in the forthcoming Governing Body meeting.

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

(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities