



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.ccd disabilities.nic.in

Case No: CCPD-AD-0080/2026

In the Matter of

Shri Rajpal Rojh

...Complainant

Versus

The Managing Director, Central Bank of India

..Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Rajpal Rojh, submitted a grievance dated 17.06.2026 stating that despite repeated representations, the Central Bank of India had not considered his request for transfer to Hanumangarh. The Complainant submitted that he is the primary caregiver of his wife, who is employed with UCO Bank and is a person with benchmark disability (55% locomotor disability due to Limb Girdle Muscular Dystrophy). He stated that his wife had been transferred to Hanumangarh on medical grounds to facilitate better treatment and rehabilitation; however, his own request for transfer to the same location had not been acceded to, causing considerable hardship in providing care and support. He requested that his transfer be considered on caregiver, spouse and medical grounds in accordance with the applicable Government guidelines.

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 Rajpal Rojh	Complainant

2.	Shri Avinash Kumar, Deputy General Manager (HRD)	Respondent
3.	Shri Pradeep Yadav, Assistant General Manager-HR	Respondent
4.	Shri Murli, Chief Manager	Respondent
5.	Shri Shashank Shekhar Dubey, Manager	Respondent
6.	Shri Ankit Sikan, Regional Head, Jodhpur Region	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, Shri Vinash Kumar, Deputy General Manager (HRD), appearing on behalf of the Respondent, submitted that the Complainant was appointed as an Agriculture Finance Officer and, in accordance with the applicable service requirements, is required to complete a mandatory tenure in a rural branch. He further submitted that the Bank has, on multiple occasions, accommodated the Complainant's requests by retaining him in his preferred region and by posting him to suitable locations. It was submitted that the Complainant is presently serving at the only rural branch in the concerned region and has not yet completed the mandatory tenure required under the transfer policy. The Respondent further stated that, under the Bank's policy, requests made on caregiver grounds are ordinarily considered for posting within the preferred region rather than at a specific branch, and assured that the Complainant's request would be considered sympathetically in the next transfer cycle.

3.2 The Court sought clarification regarding the distance between the Complainant's present place of posting and the location where his wife is presently posted. The Respondent submitted that the distance is approximately 240 kilometres and explained that the present situation arose after the Complainant's wife, who is employed with UCO Bank, was transferred to Hanumangarh by her employer. The Respondent reiterated that the Complainant himself had not been transferred by the Bank after his posting in the Jodhpur Region.

3.3 The Complainant submitted that owing to his wife's benchmark disability and continuing medical needs, including regular physiotherapy and assistance in day-to-day activities, it had become difficult to provide necessary care due to the increased distance between their respective places of posting. He requested that he be posted to a branch closer to his wife's place of posting to enable him to discharge his caregiving responsibilities effectively.

3.4 Upon consideration of the submissions made by both parties, the Court observed that the increased distance between the spouses was not occasioned by any transfer effected by the Respondent Bank, but had arisen consequent upon the transfer of the Complainant's wife by her employer. In the circumstances, the Court found no deficiency or arbitrariness on the part of the Respondent in relation to the grievance raised. Nevertheless, the Court observed that the needs of caregivers of persons with benchmark disabilities merit due consideration and recommended that, whenever an appropriate opportunity arises under the Bank's transfer policy, the Respondent may consider the Complainant's request empathetically, keeping in view his status as a caregiver and endeavouring, to the extent administratively feasible, to reduce the distance between the spouses.

3.5 In view of the above observations and recommendations, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary. Liberty is reserved to the Complainant to approach the appropriate authority or this Court afresh, if circumstances so warrant.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities