



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: 14427/1023/2023

In the matter of—

Shri G. D. Waghmare

...Complainant

Versus

The Commissioner,
 Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti (NVS), Noida, Uttar Pradesh

...Respondent

1. Gist of Complaint:

1.1 Shri G. D. Waghmare, a person with 49% locomotor disability working as PGT (English) under Navodaya Vidyalaya Samiti, filed a complaint dated 20.08.2023 alleging physical and mental harassment at Jawahar Navodaya Vidyalaya, Panchgaon, District Bhandara, Maharashtra. The Complainant submitted that after his transfer on disability grounds from JNV Bhupdevpur, District Raigarh (Chhattisgarh) to JNV Panchgaon, Bhandara, he was not provided suitable ground floor accommodation despite his disability and was initially allotted first floor quarters causing hardship in mobility. He further submitted that he was assigned duties such as House Master / MOD and other responsibilities allegedly inconsistent with the facilities and exemptions ordinarily extended to employees with disabilities.

2. Notice Issued:

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Respondent vide notice dated 30.08.2023 stating provisions u/s 3, 21, 23, 75, and section 20 (3) of the RPwD Act, 2016 and Rule 8(3) of the RPwD Rules, 2017.

3. Respondent's Reply to the Notice:

3.1 The Respondent filed reply dated 16.10.2023, wherein it was submitted that at the time of joining, no vacant ground floor quarter was available and the Complainant was accordingly accommodated otherwise; it was further submitted that considering his disability, House Master duties earlier assigned to him had

been re-assigned to another employee and he was relieved from such charge, and the Respondent also stated that the Complainant had been provided accessible workplace facilities and that institutional duties in residential schools are rotational in nature.

4. Further Submissions of the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant in his further representations reiterated that he continued to face inconvenience and requested that proper disability-related accommodation, which had not been fully extended, be provided to ensure his needs are comprehensively met.

5. Hearing:

5 . 1 A hearing was conducted on 10.12.2025 in hybrid mode wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S. No.	Name & Designation	On behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1	Shri G. D. Waghmare	Complainant	Virtual
2	Shri Rajesh, Assistant Commissioner, NVS HQ	Respondent	Virtual

6. Record of Proceedings:

6.1 During the hearing, the Complainant reiterated that ground floor accommodation had not been provided and that assignment of certain duties caused hardship in view of his locomotor disability.

6.2 The Respondent submitted that ground floor accommodation would be provided to the Complainant upon completion of ongoing construction/ availability and assured that the same would be done within approximately six months. He further submitted that duties such as House Master/MOD are rotational and institutional in nature, though appropriate adjustments can be considered.

6.3 This Court observed that while internal administrative matters ordinarily fall within the management domain, reasonable accommodation and disability-sensitive adjustments are required under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

7. Observations and Recommendations:

7.1 The Court observed that the principal grievance relates to accessible accommodation and the performance of duties in a residential school, noting that under Sections 3 and 20 of the RPwD Act, 2016, every establishment is obligated to ensure equality and reasonable accommodation.

7.2 During the proceedings, the Court recommended that the management consider allocating alternate or equivalent assignments to avoid hardship and noted that the Grievance Redressal Officer, mandated under Section 23 of the Act, appeared not to be fully functional or adequately disseminated within the establishment.

7.3 The Court recommended the Respondent to submit an Action Taken

Report regarding accommodation within the assured period, in accordance with Section 76 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 within 90 days, failing which this Court may be constrained to initiate action under sections 77, 89 and 93 of the Act.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities