



न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF 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, New Delhi-110075; Tel.: (011) 20892364
Email: ccpd@nic.in; Website: www.ccdisabilities.nic.in

Case No.: CCPD-AD-0046/2026

Sh. Ajay A

Email: ajayarumugam580@gmail.com

...Complainant

versus

(1) The Chairman,

Railway Recruitment Board

Email: dghrrailway.rbr@nic.in

(2) The Secretary,

Ministry of Railway (Railway Board)

Rail Bhawan, New Delhi

Email: secyrb@rb.railnet.gov.in

...Respondents

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr. Ajay A, a person with 80% low vision filed a complaint regarding denial of compensatory time in the Railway Recruitment Board, Non Technical Popular Categories (Graduate) Examination against CEN No. 06/2025.

1.2 The Complainant stated that he correctly declared his disability

and is legally entitled to reasonable accommodation, he was denied compensatory extra time during CBT-I. He contends that this denial violates the examination rules, government guidelines, and his statutory rights, despite his consistent academic merit and eligibility under PwBD provisions.

1.3 The Complainant further submitted that the CBT-II examination scheduled for 10 July 2026 is likely to again proceed without granting him compensatory time of 20 minutes per hour (30 minutes for a 90-minute exam). He argues that this denial is arbitrary, discriminatory, and contrary to the RPwD Act, 2016, Government OM dated 29.08.2018, and Supreme Court judgments including *Vikash Kumar v. UPSC* and *Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India*. He also contends that distinguishing between “low vision” and “blindness” for denying benefits is unjust and contrary to the examination rules. The complainant therefore seeks urgent directions to the Railway Recruitment Board to grant him compensatory time at the prescribed rate of 20 minutes per hour for the CBT-II examination, ensuring a total duration of 120 minutes for a 90-minute paper, and to ensure uniform implementation of PwBD accommodations in accordance with applicable law and guidelines.

2. Notice of admissibility:

2.1 The matter is listed for an admissibility hearing on 22.06.2026 to consider whether the present representation is maintainable and fit to be registered for further proceedings before the Court of the Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities (CCPD).

3. Hearing:

3.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted in hybrid mode on 22.06.2026 wherein following parties were present:

Sl. No.	Name and Designation of the Party/Representative	On behalf of	Mode
1.	Advocate AM Venkatakrishnan	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Devendra Yadav- Chairman- RRB,	Respondent	Online

	Chennai		
--	---------	--	--

3.2 During the hearing, the Complainant a candidate with a B.Sc. in Agriculture, stated that he had successfully cleared the first stage of the Railway Recruitment Board examination and was scheduled to appear for the next stage. He contended that he had been denied 20 minutes of compensatory extra time for the examination on the ground that such benefit was not applicable to low vision candidates. He further submitted that he does not use a scribe and instead relies on a magnifying lens to independently write the examination.

3.3 The Railway Recruitment Board representative submitted that as per the applicable recruitment rules and notification, benefits such as scribe assistance or compensatory time are subject to the production of required medical certification. It was stated that in the earlier examination stage, the candidate had not submitted the specific certificate indicating difficulty in writing speed. The Respondent further clarified that if the required documentation is provided, the candidate may be considered for either scribe facility or compensatory time as per the guidelines.

3.4 The Court observed that the Complainant, having 80% visual impairment, effectively falls within the blind category for the purpose of reasonable accommodation. It noted that candidates using assistive devices such as magnifying lenses and choosing to write independently should not be placed at a disadvantage. The Court held that compensatory time is a justified accommodation in such cases and directed that the complainant be granted 20 minutes of extra time for the examination, without insisting on additional medical certification, and disposed of the matter accordingly.

4. Observations and Recommendations:

4.1 The Court observes that the Complainant is a person with benchmark disability having 80% visual impairment (Low Vision), and is therefore entitled to the protection, rights, and reasonable accommodation measures guaranteed under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

4.2 The denial of compensatory time to the Complainant is inconsistent with the principles of reasonable accommodation under Section 2(y) and equality and non-discrimination under Section 3 of the RPwD Act, 2016. The distinction drawn between “Low Vision” and “Blindness” for the purpose of granting compensatory time is not in consonance with the objective of ensuring equal participation of persons with disabilities.

4.3 The Court notes that the Complainant uses a magnifying device and prefers to write the examination independently rather than avail the services of a scribe. Such independent participation should be encouraged, and candidates opting for assistive devices should not be placed at a disadvantage vis-à-vis candidates availing scribe facilities.

4.4 In view of the Complainant’s certified 80% visual impairment, insistence on any additional medical certificate for grant of compensatory time appears unnecessary, particularly when the disability and its functional impact are already established through a valid benchmark disability certificate.

4.5 Accordingly, the Respondent-Railway Recruitment Board is advised to grant the Complainant compensatory time at the rate of 20 minutes per hour of examination for the forthcoming CBT-II and other applicable stages of the recruitment process, and to ensure that examination accommodations for persons with benchmark disabilities are provided in accordance with the RPwD Act, 2016 and applicable Government guidelines.

5. The case is disposed of accordingly.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities