



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  
 5<sup>th</sup> 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. 14702/1141/2023

**In the matter of-**

Shri Sujina S Babu

**...Complainant**

**Versus**

The Director General,  
 Sports Authority of India  
 Head Office

Jawaharalal Nehru Stadium Complex (East Gate)  
 Lodhi road, New Delhi- 110003

Email - dg-sai@gov.in

**...Respondent**

**1. Gist of the case:**

1.1 Shri Sujina S. Babu, General Secretary of the Physically Challenged All Sports Association Kerala, submitted a complaint on 13.12.2023 seeking inclusion of a differently-abled Archery Coach in a six-week course conducted by the Sports Authority of India. Sh. Kishore A.M., the State President and Kerala's only Para Archery Coach, has been providing free training to both differently-abled and non-disabled athletes across the state. His dedication has helped several athletes achieve success at the state and national levels. Despite his contributions, he is unable to apply for the course in Patiala because he has not completed the 10th grade. Considering his experience, impact, and multilingual skills, he is requested to be granted special admission. He may be allowed to attend as an honorary or non-certified participant. This would enable him to further strengthen the development of para archery in Kerala.

**2. Notice issued to the Respondent:**

A Notice dated 19.12.2023 was issued to the Respondent for forwarding their comments within 30 days to this Court u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as "the Act").

### 3. Submissions made by the Respondent:

3.1 Respondent filed their reply dated 29.12.2023 and submitted that as per the circular dated 14.08.2023, eligibility for the Six-Week Certificate Course in Sports Coaching (Dec 2023 - Jan 2024) includes a minimum educational qualification of 10+2 (Senior Secondary), relevant sports achievements, and age between 20-42 years (with relaxation for certain categories).

3.2 Mr. Kishore A.M does not meet the required educational qualification of 10+2 pass and is therefore ineligible for admission. Fulfilment of this criterion is essential to understand course content related to sports and sports science, and the certificate course can also serve as a stepping stone to a diploma course in sports coaching.

### 4. Submissions made in Rejoinder:

4.1 Complainant filed his rejoinder dated Mr Kishore A.M, a national-level archery competitor, who has significantly contributed to developing differently-abled athletes in Kerala through innovative archery training. Since the Sports Authority of India offers courses on new archery techniques, it is requested that he be allowed to attend the course under a non-certificate or honorary certificate category, as a special case, to support the continued upliftment of differently-abled sportspersons in the state.

### 5. Hearing:

5.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 01.10.2025, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties /Representatives	Parties	Mode
1.	Mr. Kishore A.M	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Kamal Ali Khan, Academic Incharge, Netaji Subhas National Institute of Sports, Patiala, Punjab	For Respondent	Online
3.	Ms. Lincy, Law officer, Head office, Sports Authority of India	For Respondent	Online

## **6. Proceedings During the Hearing:**

6.1 At the outset, the Complainant submitted that he is engaged as a coach for both persons with disabilities and non-disabled persons. He claims to have experience and achievements in sports at the national and state levels. He sought admission to a six-week coaching certification course conducted by SAI. SAI prescribed minimum educational qualifications (10+2) and sports achievement criteria that he does not fulfil. He sought special consideration and relaxation in eligibility norms for persons with disabilities.

6.2 The Respondent submitted that the Coach Certification Course has mandatory eligibility criteria, including a minimum educational qualification of 10+2, and a minimum sports achievement of securing at least third place at a district-level competition recognised by authorised bodies. These criteria are uniformly applicable and are part of an approved policy. No relaxation is provided for any category, including persons with disabilities, as the standards are already minimal and essential for maintaining professional competence.

6.3 During the hearing, the Court observed that the complainant had not enclosed a disability certificate along with the complaint. The nature and extent of disability were not clearly stated in the original complaint. No documentary proof of sports achievements was produced.

6.4 Upon careful consideration of the submissions and records, the Court observed that:

(a) Under the RPwD Act, 2016, benefits and protections are available only to persons who are certified as persons with disabilities under the Act. In the present case, no valid disability certificate was submitted.

(b) The complainant has not produced any documentary evidence to substantiate claims of sports achievements at district, state, national, or international levels.

(c) Reasonable accommodation under Section 2(y) and Section 3 (5) of the Act does not imply a complete waiver of essential qualifications or dilution of standards mandated by a competent authority.

(d) The Court does not have jurisdiction to compel an authority to abandon or substantially dilute mandatory eligibility criteria prescribed under policy, especially when such criteria are uniformly applied.

(e) Without fulfilment of minimum educational and eligibility requirements, the complainant cannot claim a legal right to admission to the course.

## **7. Recommendations:**

7.1 In view of the above facts and legal position, it is clear that the complaint lacks merit due to the non-submission of disability certification, the absence of proof of eligibility, and the failure to meet the minimum prescribed qualifications. This Court finds no grounds to proceed further with the complaint.

7.2 Simultaneously, the Sports Authority of India is advised to consider, at a policy level, whether reasonable and non-dilutive accommodations or alternative pathways can be evolved to promote participation of persons with disabilities in coaching and allied professional courses, consistent with the spirit of the Act.

7.3 In terms of Section 76 of the Act, the respondents are recommended to submit the Action Taken Report on this Order within 3 months from the date of this Order.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

**(S. Govindaraj)**  
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities