



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, एनआई.एस.डी. भवन., जी2-, सेक्टर10-, 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.ccdisabilities.nic.in

Case No. CCPD/14449/1041/2023

In the matter of:

Mr. Ravindra Chouhan ...Complainant

Versus

**Regional Director
Staff Selection Commission
Bhopal (M.P.) ...Respondent**

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Mr. Ravindra Chouhan, a person with 60 percent locomotor disability affecting both upper limbs and the right lower limb; filed the present complaint dated 22.08.2023 alleging denial of reasonable accommodation and misbehaviour by examination staff during the Staff Selection Commission Combined Higher Secondary Level (Tier-I) Examination 2023.

1.2 The complaint pertains to an incident that occurred on 11.08.2023 at Trinity Institute of Technology and Research Bhopal during Shift-II of the examination. The complainant submitted that he writes examinations using his feet and therefore required an additional bench. According to him the bench was available outside the examination room but was not provided promptly due to inaction and lack of coordination among the centre staff. As a result valuable examination time was lost. He further alleged that the computer system was started before he was properly seated and before the necessary writing materials were provided. The complainant stated that this caused anxiety and adversely affected his performance resulting in an incomplete attempt despite a year of preparation. He also alleged that a senior examination official behaved rudely and denied the existence of any obligation to provide such accommodation under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016. The complainant further alleged that threats were made regarding future examinations and that the entire incident was captured on CCTV footage.

1.3 The complainant sought provision of security or support personnel for future

examinations or alternatively a change of examination centre. He also sought disciplinary action against the concerned official issuance of a written assurance regarding provision of an extra bench in future examinations and implementation of systemic measures to prevent similar incidents involving candidates with disabilities.

2. Notice Issued to the Respondent:

2.1 In exercise of the powers conferred under Sections 75 and 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 a notice dated 05.09.2023 along with copies of the complaint and supporting documents was issued to the Respondent seeking comments on affidavit regarding the allegations made in the complaint.

3. Reply Filed by the Respondent:

3.1 The Respondent vide letter dated 14.11.2023 submitted its reply through email and denied any violation of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016. It was stated that the complainant had been provided the option of availing a scribe facility in accordance with the applicable guidelines but had chosen to write the examination using his feet with the assistance of an additional bench. The Respondent submitted that the requested bench was provided and that necessary adjustments were made without affecting other candidates. It was further stated that the computer system was activated in accordance with standard procedures and that any delay which may have occurred was minimal and unintentional. The allegations of misbehaviour threats and harassment were denied. The Respondent maintained that the complainant was treated with dignity and in accordance with the applicable examination guidelines and requested closure of the matter.

4. Rejoinder Filed by the Complainant:

4.1 The complainant vide letter dated 29.11.2023 disputed the contents of the Respondent's reply and reiterated the allegations made in the complaint. He asserted that the delay in providing the additional bench was entirely attributable to the examination staff and that he suffered mental distress and loss of effective examination time. He further stated that the examination officer behaved discourteously and made inappropriate remarks regarding future accommodations. The complainant reiterated that he did not require a scribe and preferred to write independently using his feet in order to preserve his dignity autonomy and self-reliance. He requested appropriate action against the concerned official and sought systemic reforms to ensure that candidates with disabilities are not subjected to similar difficulties.

5. Hearing:

5.1 The matter was listed for hearing on 25.11.2025 through hybrid mode wherein the following parties were present:

Sl. No.	Name and Designation	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1	Mr. Ravindra Chouhan	Complainant	Online

2 Mr. Pradeep Yadav Director Respondent
SSC

Online

6. Record of Proceedings:

6.1 During the hearing the complainant submitted that he appeared in examinations conducted by the Staff Selection Commission in the years 2023 2024 and 2025. He stated that in the year 2023 he was ultimately allowed to write the examination using his feet with the assistance of a bench but only after considerable delay. According to him the examination had already commenced by that time and the delay caused anxiety, loss of effective writing time and disruption to his examination. The complainant further submitted that during the examination conducted in the year 2024 he was not permitted to write using his feet and was instead required to avail the services of a scribe. He stated that this adversely affected his performance and deprived him of his preferred mode of writing the examination. The complainant submitted that during the examination conducted in the year 2025 he was provided a bench and was able to write the examination independently without any difficulty. According to him this demonstrated that the accommodation sought by him was reasonable practical and capable of implementation.

6.4 The Complainant contended that the absence of written clarity regarding permissible accommodations and the insistence on the use of a scribe were inconsistent with the principles of reasonable accommodation autonomy and dignity embodied in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016. He requested issuance of a written assurance permitting him to write examinations using his feet with the assistance of a bench.

6.5 The Respondent submitted that the complainant had not made any prior request for provision of a bench before the examination conducted in 2023 and had raised the issue only upon reaching the examination centre. Since the applicable examination guidelines did not specifically provide for such an arrangement the request had to be addressed on the spot which resulted in some logistical delay.

6.6 The Respondent denied all allegations of harassment intimidation or disrespect and submitted that the complainant was treated fairly and with dignity. The Respondent relied upon reports received from the examination centre which indicated that no misconduct had taken place.

7. Observations/Recommendations:

7.1 Upon consideration of the pleadings on record and the submissions made during the hearing, it is observed that the complainant has consistently sought the facility of writing examinations independently using his feet instead of availing the services of a scribe. It is also noted that the accommodation was successfully provided during the examination conducted in 2025 which demonstrates that such an arrangement is reasonable practical and capable of implementation without causing any undue burden on the examination authorities. The principles of equality, dignity, autonomy and reasonable accommodation embodied in the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016 require that examination authorities

make appropriate arrangements based on the individual needs of candidates with disabilities.

7.2 In view of the above, it is recommended that the Respondent consider incorporating a suitable provision in its application forms and examination processes enabling candidates with disabilities to indicate specific reasonable accommodation requirements beyond the existing options of scribe and compensatory time. Such a measure would facilitate advance planning and minimise avoidable difficulties at examination centres.

7.3 It is further recommended that the Respondent undertake periodic sensitisation and training programmes for invigilators/examination personnel and other functionaries dealing with candidates with disabilities so as to ensure respectful conduct effective implementation of reasonable accommodation and compliance with the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act 2016.

7.4 The Respondent is suggested to furnish an Action Taken Report indicating the measures taken pursuant to the above recommendations within a period of ninety days from the date of receipt of this Order.

8. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persosn with Disabilities