



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-AD-0094/2026

In the Matter of

Shri Himanshu Sharma

...Complainant

Versus

The Director General, National Testing Agency

..Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Himanshu Sharma, a person with 80% benchmark locomotor (orthopaedic) disability, submitted a grievance dated 08.07.2026 stating that while applying for the UGC-NET Examination in Commerce, his PwBD sub-category was incorrectly selected during the online application process by a cybercafé operator. He contended that, owing to this erroneous entry, he was assessed under an incorrect disability category and consequently failed to qualify, despite having secured marks equivalent to the cut-off applicable to his actual PwBD category. Alleging that the incorrect entry had adversely affected his examination result and academic prospects, the Complainant sought correction of his PwBD category, reconsideration of his candidature, and grant of the benefits available under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 14.07.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Himanshu Sharma	Complainant

2.	Ms. Shruti Gupta, Legal Officer	Respondent
3.	Shri Vijay Kumar, Director (Examinations), National Testing Agency	Respondent

2.2 The Complainant was initially absent despite repeated attempts by the Registry to establish contact through email and telephone. He joined the proceedings after the matter had substantially concluded.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted that the grievance pertained to the Complainant's request for alteration of his PwBD category after completion of the examination process. He submitted that the online application process commenced well in advance and that every candidate independently fills and submits the application through a secure registration portal accessible only to the candidate. It was further submitted that, following closure of the application window, the NTA provides a dedicated correction window during which candidates are permitted to rectify any inadvertent mistakes in their applications. The Respondent contended that the Complainant neither corrected the alleged error during the prescribed correction period nor approached the authorities at the appropriate stage. It was further submitted that NTA officials are neither authorised nor empowered to alter candidates' personal particulars after the examination process, as such modifications would affect the integrity of the examination and result preparation. The Respondent therefore submitted that alteration of the disability category after completion of the examination process was neither administratively feasible nor legally permissible.

3.2 Upon consideration of the submissions, the Court observed that the alleged error admittedly arose from the information furnished in the online application and that the responsibility to verify the correctness of all particulars before final submission rests with the applicant. The Court further noted that the examination authority had provided an adequate correction window during which any inadvertent mistake could have been rectified. Having failed to avail himself of the prescribed opportunity, the Complainant could not seek correction of the application particulars after completion of the examination process and at a stage when the results had already been finalized or were under process.

3.3 The Court further observed that no procedural irregularity, arbitrariness, or deficiency in service on the part of the Respondent had been established. On the contrary, the Respondent had followed the notified examination procedure

uniformly by providing sufficient opportunity to all candidates to verify and correct their applications before the examination. The Court held that the consequences arising from an error in the application form, whether committed by the applicant personally or by a third party acting on his behalf, cannot subsequently be attributed to the examination authority.

3.4 During the course of the proceedings, the Complainant joined the hearing and sought reconsideration of his request. The Court, however, reiterated that once the examination process had concluded, no correction of the disability category or consequential reconsideration of the candidature could be directed, particularly when the prescribed correction mechanism had not been availed. The Court advised the Complainant to exercise due diligence while submitting future examination applications. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities