



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. CCPD/13940/1021/2023

In the matter of —

Shri P Veeramani

...Complainant

Versus

The Chairman,
Steel Authority of India Limited,
New Delhi

...Respondent

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Hearing:

1.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 11.12.2025. The following parties/representatives were present:

S. No.	Name and designation of the Attendees	On behalf of	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. P Veeramani	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Manas Rath- GM- HR	Respondent	Online
3.	Smt. B Lavanya- AGM(HR)	Respondent	Online
4.	Mr. D Suresh, AGM(HR)	Respondent	Online

1.2 During the hearing, the Complainant contended that he had been unjustly denied promotion from the non-executive cadre (S-11 grade) to the executive cadre (J-0 grade) despite being eligible and having appeared in the promotion process on multiple occasions. He submitted

that he had qualified in the written examination conducted in 2022 and had consistently sought promotion in accordance with the reservation policies applicable to persons with disabilities (PwDs) under Government of India guidelines and the Department of Personnel and Training (DoPT) Office Memorandum. He alleged that the management failed to extend the benefits of reservation to him and promoted another candidate instead. The Complainant requested the Court to direct the management to grant him the promotion due to him.

1.3 The Management submitted that promotions from the non-executive to executive cadre are governed by a roster-based reservation system and a two-stage selection process comprising a written examination and interview. According to SAIL, the PwD vacancy arising in the relevant roster cycle was initially earmarked for candidates with blindness/low vision and, upon non-availability of such candidates, was interchanged and ultimately filled in 2022 by a candidate with hearing impairment. The Complainant, who belonged to a different disability category and stream, had appeared under the unreserved category and secured 72.2 marks, whereas the selected candidate secured 80 marks. The Management further stated that in the 2024 promotion cycle the Complainant failed to qualify in the written examination even after being granted the prescribed relaxation in qualifying marks. It was also submitted that another PwD vacancy was expected to arise in the 2026 promotion cycle and that the Complainant would be considered for promotion if he successfully cleared the selection process.

1.4 The Court sought clarification regarding the operation of the reservation roster, the interchange of disability categories, and the basis on which the PwD vacancy had been filled. The Court further questioned whether the vacancy should have been carried forward or made available to the Complainant and examined the circumstances surrounding the Complainant's non-selection. The Court rejected the Complainant's contention that he was entitled to additional examination time, noting that such concessions are generally available only to candidates eligible for a scribe or with specified disabilities.

1.5 Finding the record insufficient to conclusively determine whether the promotion process had been conducted in accordance with reservation norms, the Court directed the Respondent organisation to submit within seven days all relevant documents, including the written

examination marks, cut-off marks, details of the selected candidate, and comparative records of the complainant and selected candidate. The Court also expressed concern regarding the Respondent's apparent lack of clarity about the appointment and publication of a Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO) under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and indicated that the matter would be examined further after receipt of the documents before passing final orders.

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

Ipsita Mitra
24.6.26

(Ipsita Mitra)
Dy. Chief Commissioner