



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.: 14320/1023/2023

In the matter of:

Mr. Rishi Prasad Nayak

... **Complainant**

Versus

The Managing Director & CEO

Central Bank of India

... **Respondent**

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr Rishi Prasad Nayak, a person with benchmark locomotor disability who uses a wheelchair and is an employee of the Central Bank of India working as SWO at MVCC Branch, Indore, filed a complaint dated 20.07.2023 alleging a lack of an accessible workplace, posting at a faraway branch, and physical and mental harassment by the Branch Management.

1.2 The Complainant also alleged that the Branch Manager behaved in an insensitive manner, assigned him work not suited to his physical condition, and failed to consider his requests for reasonable accommodation in the workplace. He submitted that these actions caused him significant physical pain and mental distress.

2. Notice issued to the Respondent:

2.1 A notice dated 26.07.2023 was issued to the Respondent under Sections 6,7,20,75 and 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, directing them to submit their comments on the complaint along with relevant documents and action taken in the matter.

3. Reply filed by the Respondent

3.1 The Respondent submitted their reply dated 05.09.2023 stating

that the Complainant had joined the Bank on 29.04.2013 and had initially been posted at his hometown branch, considering his disability.

3.2 The Respondent further submitted that in September 2022, the Sanmati School Branch, where the Complainant was working, was merged into another branch. Due to administrative requirements and the presence of another employee with a disability at the requested branch, the Complainant was transferred to the MVCC Branch, which, according to the Respondent, was the nearest to his residence.

3.3 The Respondent also submitted that the Complainant had been assigned only limited work, such as passbook printing, RTGS/NEFT processing and CIF punching, which formed part of the normal duties of the post but were comparatively lighter considering his disability.

3.4 It was further submitted that the Bank had ordered an internal inquiry to examine the allegations of harassment. The inquiry report indicated that branch staff had extended support to the Complainant and that no evidence of deliberate harassment by the Branch Manager had been established.

3.5 The Respondent therefore denied the allegations of discrimination or harassment and submitted that the posting was made considering operational requirements and administrative constraints.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant

4.1 The Complainant filed a rejoinder stating that the Respondent's reply was misleading and did not correctly represent the circumstances of his transfer and working conditions.

4.2 He reiterated that the branch where he was posted was not accessible for a wheelchair user and that he faced serious difficulty in accessing the workplace facilities, including washrooms and seating arrangements.

4.3 The Complainant further submitted that he had repeatedly requested the management to provide reasonable accommodation and a posting closer to his residence, but his requests were not adequately considered.

5. Hearing

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

S. No.	Name and Designation of the Party/Representative	Parties	Mode of Attendance
1	Mr. Rishi Prasad Nayak	Complainant	Online
	Mr Poppy Sharma - General Manager,		

2	HR Mr. Dheeraj Goel - DGM Mr Murli Krishna - Law Officer	Respondent	Online
---	--	------------	--------

6. Record of Proceedings

6.1 During the hearing, the Complainant reiterated that the posting given to him was not accessible and caused serious hardship due to his disability. He also stated that the workplace layout and washroom access posed safety risks for him.

6.2 The Respondent acknowledged that certain accessibility challenges existed in the branch premises and assured the Court that necessary modifications would be undertaken to improve accessibility.

6.3 The Respondent further explained that the transfer was necessitated due to the closure of the Complainant's previous branch and administrative requirements relating to staffing of other branches.

6.4 The Court observed that banks are public places and therefore must comply with the accessibility requirements under Sections 44, 45 and 46 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, read with Rule 15 of the RPwD Rules, 2017. The Court further noted that posting an employee with disability to an inaccessible workplace undermines the rights guaranteed under Articles 14, 16, 19 and 21 of the Constitution of India.

6.5 The Court also directed that while considering transfer or posting of employees with disabilities, the Respondent must take into account the provisions of Sections 20(5) and 21 of the RPwD Act, 2016, read with Rule 8 (3)(c) of the RPwD Rules, 2017. The Respondent was advised to review their stand and resolve the grievance as per their policy. An Action Taken Report was sought within 15 days, with a copy to the Complainant, who was also allowed to submit his rejoinder, if any, within a further period of 7 days.

7. Action Taken Report of the Respondent

7.1 The Respondent informed this Court that the Complainant has been provided with his preferred posting, thereby resolving the primary grievance raised in the complaint. The Respondent submitted a written communication dated 02.07.2025 explicitly conveying his satisfaction with the steps taken by the Bank. The Complainant confirmed that he is fully satisfied and has no further grievance or concern pertaining to his present place of posting. The text of his communication is reproduced below:

“मेरे अनुरोध पर क्षेत्रीय कार्यालय द्वारा मेरी पसंद कि शाखा मे नियुक्ति कि गई एवं मेरे द्वारा मांग कि गई सुविधायों को शाखा प्रबंधक द्वारा उपलब्ध कराया गया। मे अपनी पसंद कि शाखा में पदस्थापना पाकर संतुस्ट हु एवं मुझे यहा पर किसी प्रकार कि समस्याशिकायत नही है। इसके लिए शाखा प्रबंधक

को धन्यवाद देता हूँ।

7.2 The complete redressal of grievance was further confirmed by the Complainant vide his email dated 16.03.2026 in response to a written query of this Court sent to him through an email on the same day.

8. Observations

8.1 The Court notes that the complaint primarily related to issues of workplace accessibility, reasonable accommodation and posting of an employee with disability.

8.2 The Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 mandates that establishments ensure non-discrimination and provide reasonable accommodation to persons with disabilities in employment.

8.3 The Court further observes that accessibility of workplace infrastructure is not only necessary for employees with disabilities but also for members of the public who access banking services.

8.4 In the present case, the Respondent has subsequently addressed the concerns raised by the Complainant by taking corrective measures and providing him with a suitable posting.

8.5 In view of the above developments, the grievance of the Complainant appears to have been substantially redressed.

9. Recommendations

9.1 The Court recommends that the Respondent Bank ensure strict compliance with the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, with regard to accessibility of branch premises and provision of reasonable accommodation to employees with disabilities.

9.2 The Respondent is further advised to sensitise its officers and staff regarding the rights of persons with disabilities and the obligations of establishments under the Act so that similar grievances do not arise in future.

10. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities