



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: DNO/26/CCPD/6088

In the Matter of

Shri Suraj Kumar

...Complainant

Versus

The Director (personnel-1), Delhi Development Authority

..Respondent

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 29.04.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Suraj Kumar	Complainant
2.	Adv. Nishtha Chawla	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The complainant, Shri Suraj Kumar, a person with Benchmark specific Learning disability submitted a grievance dated 31.03.2026 alleges irregularities in the Delhi Development Authority (DDA) Mali recruitment process, claiming that a candidate with lower marks was selected for a PwD reserved seat, while the complainant was bypassed despite having a higher score. Having received no response to their formal email inquiries regarding this discrepancy, the complainant is seeking official intervention to investigate the selection process and ensure that recruitment is conducted fairly based on merit.

2.2 During the proceedings, Ms. Nishtha Chawla, Advocate representing the Delhi Development Authority (DDA), entered her formal appearance for the Respondent. She submitted that the present case brief had been allocated to her office only on the preceding evening and noted that she had not yet been served with a formal copy of the initial complaint or the allied foundational application filed by the applicant. Consequently, she requested an extension of time to seek structured instructions from the department and file a formal institutional reply on record.

3. Observations and Recommendations :

3.1 The Court observed with concern that the relevant case records were not transmitted to the empaneled counsel in a timely manner due to administrative and communication lapses. While such procedural issues may arise, they should be addressed promptly. The Court is of the view that internal administrative constraints should not impede the timely and effective consideration of grievances.

3.2 The Respondent is suggested to remedy its internal coordination gaps, and submit a comprehensive written reply addressing all parameters of the complaint within fifteen days of the issuance of this Interim order. Failure to do so may compel this Court to initiate action as per Sections 89, and 93 of the Act.

Ipsita Mitra
8.7.26
(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities