



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. 14037/1014/2023

Complainant(s):

Shri Atul Kumar Yadav

Respondent(s):

The Chairman
Bharat Immunological and
Biologicals Corporation Ltd.

Hearing (I):

A hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 16.05.2025 at the office of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, Dwarka. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Sh. Atul Kumar Yadav	Complainant	Online
2.	Sh. JC Pandey, Executive Manager, BIBCOLD	Respondent	Online

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

During the previous hearing, the Complainant was instructed to submit his response along with supporting evidence concerning his allegation of harassment by the employer and of exhausting available remedies. The Complainant stated that the Respondents had been directed to establish a grievance cell within the organization and were directed to appoint an officer to whom the evidence could be submitted. Since no such officer was appointed, the Complainant was unable to submit the evidence. The Court was informed through an email that Sh. RK Shukla, the Vice President of the organization, had been appointed as the Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO). The Complainant was unaware of this appointment.

2. The Respondent stated that the last meeting was held on 28.02.2025, and the minutes dated 07.03.2025 were received on 09.05.2025. A proposal to appoint a GRO was sent to the Ministry, and a response was received on 15.05.2025, i.e., just one day before the hearing. The Court remarked that the Respondents should not have waited for the RoP as appointment of a GRO is a statutory mandate under Section 23 of the RPwD Act, 2016, for every government establishment and non-adherence to which is a punishable offence under sections 89 and 93 of the Act.

3. The Court also expressed its dissatisfaction with the Respondent's justifications for not taking any action on the

complaint of harassment, noting that conducting an internal inquiry should not have been a challenging task.

4. The Court acknowledged that both parties had initiated some actions. However, it found the progress unsatisfactory due to the absence of any physical evidence from either the Complainant or the Respondent. The Respondents repeatedly sought adjournments citing short notice, which the Court found unconvincing and unacceptable, leading to an unpleasant situation.

5. After hearing both parties, the Court advised the Complainant to file his grievance to the GRO within 3 days of receiving this record of proceedings, and the Respondent is recommended to submit an Action Taken Report within a further period of fourteen days.

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

(Praveen Prakash Ambashta)
Dy. Chief Commissioner