



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 20892364(011) :
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

CCPD-OF-0015/1040/2026

In the matter of:

Mr. Archit Gupta

...Complainant

Versus

(1) The Secretary,
Central Board of Secondary Education
Email: secy-cbse@nic.in

(2) The Principal,
Tagore Senior Secondary School
Email: tagoremayapuri@yahoo.com

...Respondents

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. Hearing:

1.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted in hybrid mode on 18.02.2026, wherein following parties were present:

Sl. No.	Name and Designation of the Party/Representative	Parties	Mode
1.	Mrs. Nidhi Agarwal - Mother of Complainant	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Vikas Arora - (JS) (TET)- CBSE	Respondent No.1	Online
3.	Mr. Kamal Kishore Khattar- AO- Tagore Sr. Sec. School	Respondent No.2	Online

1.2 The Complainant's mother stated that her son reached the

examination centre at the prescribed reporting time and entered the premises when the gates opened. She submitted that although they had arranged their own scribe, they were informed at the centre that a scribe would instead be provided by the examination authorities, causing anxiety and uncertainty. According to her, the candidate's biometric attendance was delayed and he was not given the mandatory interaction time with the centre-provided scribe before the examination. She further alleged that during the examination, centre officials informed her that her son's documents had been misplaced and demanded the documents again, which caused mental distress and disruption. She also complained that the original stamped admit card was not returned after the examination and contended that the cumulative effect of these events caused harassment and adversely affected her son's performance.

1.3 The Respondent denied the allegations and stated that the candidate was allowed to enter and commence the examination well before the start of the examination. The Respondent maintained that the candidate did not possess the required Aadhaar Card and that only a UDID Card was produced, which necessitated verification. It was further submitted that the candidate was permitted to take the examination around 2:30 PM and that the parent was contacted subsequently to provide the required Aadhaar details. The Respondent asserted that the centre had acted in accordance with the applicable examination procedures and guidelines.

1.4 The Representative from CBSE clarified that where a scribe is arranged by the examination centre, there is a prescribed provision for interaction between the candidate and the scribe before the examination, ordinarily allowing sufficient time (including a specified interaction period) prior to commencement of the examination. CBSE acknowledged that if such interaction time was denied, the matter would require examination. CBSE also indicated that the centre's actions and compliance with the prescribed procedures would need to be verified through records and inquiry.

1.5 The Court observed that a candidate cannot ordinarily arrive with a privately arranged scribe without prior approval and compliance with the prescribed procedures. However, the Court also noted concerns regarding certain actions of the examination centre, particularly the alleged request for documents during the examination period, the non-

return of the admit card, and the allegation that adequate interaction time with the scribe may not have been provided.

1.6 Accordingly, the complaint was admitted as a case, and CBSE was directed to investigate the allegations, examine the available evidence including CCTV footage and records, and submit a detailed report within thirty days.

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

Ipsita Mitra
25.6.26

(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner