



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.ccpd.nic.in

Case No. CCPD/14314/1092/2023

In the matter of —

Shri Thakur Laxmi Singh

... Complainant

Versus

The Secretary,

Railway Board

...Respondent

1. Gist of the Case:

1.1. The complainant, Shri Thakur Laxmi Singh, a person with 100% hearing impairment, filed a formal complaint on 19.07.2023, following the repeated denial of a railway concession card. Despite holding a valid disability certificate confirmed by an automatic audiometry assessment at a Government ENT Hospital, his online application for the IRCTC Railway Concession ID Card was rejected. The rejection was based on the specific policy that hearing loss alone is insufficient for the benefit, as the current system recognizes only those who are both deaf and mute.

1.2. This exclusion persisted at physical ticket counters, where railway officials refused to accept his documents. The officials maintained that according to existing railway forms, eligibility is strictly limited to individuals classified as "deaf and dumb." Consequently, the complainant is being denied access to concessions because his specific condition—while being a total hearing impairment—does not meet the dual-criteria requirement of being both hearing and speech impaired as currently mandated by the Railway Board.

2. Notice issued to the Respondents:

2.1 A Notice dated 26.07.2023 was issued to the above mentioned Respondents for forwarding to this Court comments on affidavit on the complaint for violations of section 20, 41 and 58 of the within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply filed by the Respondents:

3.1 The Respondents via their letter dated 01.12.2023 and stated that affirmed that he is fully aware of the facts based on official records and is authorized to submit the reply.

3.2 The Respondent has stated that another similar matter—Case No. 13977/1103/2023/191754 filed by Shri Suhas Karnik—regarding railway concession/UDID card for persons with disabilities under the RPWD Act, 2016, is already under examination before the Hon'ble Court.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant filed their rejoinder dated 27.12.2023 and stated that conveyed that after receiving a letter by post from Advocate Shri Satyendra Kumar Singh, his daughter spoke to the advocate once over the phone, and he was informed that a reply from the respondent was awaited. He has now received the reply through email, but due to his hearing impairment, he finds it very difficult to understand long written communications.

4.2 He also stated that his family situation is challenging—his wife is deaf and mute and unemployed, and he has two school-going daughters studying in Classes IXth and VIIIth. His parents have passed away, and he manages all responsibilities with limited travel, occasionally using train services. Due to these hardships, he is unable to travel long distances or attend proceedings, and therefore he requests that the case be closed.

5. Hearing:

5.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 18.11.2025. The following parties/representatives were present:

S. No.	Name and designation of the Attendees	On behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri ThakurLaxmi Singh	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Rohit Kumar, Joint Director, Railway Board	Respondent	Online

6. Record of Proceedings:

6.1 The Complainant submitted that despite multiple representations to the Railway Board, railway fare concession was denied on the ground that his disability certificate mentioned only hearing impairment. It was contended that this denial caused hardship, as the complainant claimed to be severely affected in both hearing and speech.

6.2 The Railway Board, through its representative, clarified that as per the existing railway concession policy, fare concessions in the deaf and dumb category are admissible only when both hearing impairment and speech impairment are present and certified in the same individual. Concessions are not permissible in cases of only hearing impairment or only speech impairment.

6.3 The Court noted that the broader issues of recognizing the UDID card as a single unified document and expanding the categories eligible for concession were already under consideration before the Delhi High Court, including review petitions arising from earlier orders. It was submitted that the Railway Board was following a transparent and uniform procedure and was bound by existing judicial directions and policy instructions.

7. Observations and Recommendations:

7.1. Upon examining the records, the Court noted that while the Complainant appeared to have speech difficulties, his official disability certificate only documented a hearing impairment. Since railway concessions are strictly granted based on specific documentary evidence of both hearing and speech impairments, the Court found that the railway authorities were not legally at fault for rejecting the claim. This case, however, highlights a significant practical gap between medical

reality and official certification, particularly for those with profound hearing loss where speech development is naturally impacted but not always explicitly certified as a separate disability.

7.2. To resolve this, the Court recommended that the Complainant seek a revised or detailed medical certificate from a competent authority that clearly outlines both impairments for future eligibility. Furthermore, the Court advised the Railway Board to consult with the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment to review policy regarding 100% hearing impairment cases. The recommendation suggests evolving a simplified, disability-friendly verification process—specifically utilizing the UDID card—to reduce procedural burdens and ensure that those with congenital conditions are not unfairly excluded due to administrative technicalities.

8. Accordingly, the matter is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities