



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

DNO/5781/CCPD/2026**In the matter of —****Shri Satender Yadav****... Complainant**

Versus

**The Chairman,
Airport Authority of India****... Respondent****Parties Present on the date of preliminary hearing:****(1) Shri Satender Yadav, the Complainant****(2) Shri S.K. Malik, General Manager, ED (CNS-OM), for the Respondent****1. Gist of the Complaint:**

1.1 Shri Satender Yadav, working as a Manager – CNS at Indira Gandhi International Airport, Delhi, filed a complaint on the Portal regarding cancellation of his transfer order issued by Airport Authority of India (Respondent) on the grounds that he is a caregiver to his father who is a person with 83% Multiple Disabilities.

1.2 The matter was taken and scheduled for preliminary hearing on **10.03.2026** through hybrid mode; to decide whether the matter is admissible to register a case for further trial or not.

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

2.1 The representative appearing for the Respondent submitted that as per the transfer policy, it is a mandatory requirement that his father should be financially dependent on him. Since his father is drawing a pension and the pension amount is more than the amount specified in the transfer policy, and that is why, his father cannot be treated as dependent family member of the Complainant. Had his father been dependent on him, the cancellation of his transfer would certainly be considered.

2.2 The Complainant reiterated his complaint. However, in reply to the questions he submitted that his father is a senior citizen. His father and his mother are residing with him. His mother is a breast cancer operative and is, thereby, not able to fully take care of his father. His elder brother is not residing with him.

3. Observations & Recommendations:

3.1. It is an admitted fact that the complainant's father is a person with 83% multiple disabilities. However, he is not entirely dependent upon the complainant, as the complainant's mother is also residing with him. Further, as submitted by the Respondent, financial dependency alone cannot be treated as the sole criterion; physical dependency and caregiving requirements must also be considered.

3.2 In the present case, the primary caregiver is the complainant's mother, while the complainant himself acts as a secondary caregiver. Therefore, the caregiving circumstances are clearly distinguishable. Where there is no other family member available to support a person with disabilities and the employee alone is the sole caregiver, a recommendation for cancellation of the transfer order may be justified.

3.3 This Court is of the view that, independent of the Respondent's arguments and considering the practical realities of the matter, since there is another person available to provide care, the dependency cannot be said to rest solely upon the complainant.

4. Accordingly, the matter is closed, being not fit for registration for further trial/proceedings.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities