



सत्यमेव जयते
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-0076/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant(s)

Shri Ankit Vishwakarma

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Vice Chairman, Delhi Development Authority (DDA)
2. The Commissioner, Delhi Police

1. Hearing

1.1. 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 Ankit Vishwakarma	Complainant
2.	Shri Ravi Shankar, Principal Commissioner (Horticulture)	Respondent 1
3.	Shri Rajesh Kumar Sah, Inspector	Respondent 2
4.	Shri Rajat Malik, SI	Respondent 2

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant submitted that his 6-year-old daughter with autism spectrum disorder (ASD) was subjected to discrimination, harassment, and

threatening behaviour by an unidentified person at DDA Park, Sector 13, Dwarka, New Delhi, on 20.06.2026. He alleged that when his family requested access to a swing after informing the individual about his daughter's disability, the individual refused to cooperate, repeatedly referred to the child as "pagal", and threatened to physically assault his wife and daughter. He further stated that the incident caused severe emotional distress to his daughter and family and amounted to discrimination against a child with disability. He requested an inquiry into the incident, identification of the individual through available evidence, appropriate legal action, and directions to promote sensitivity and non-discrimination towards children with disabilities in public places.

2.2 During the proceedings, the representative of the Respondent 1 (DDA) submitted that upon receipt of the complaint through email, the matter was examined and an officer was immediately deputed to inspect the concerned park. It was submitted that the park in question is not equipped with CCTV surveillance and that only a single security guard is deployed at the main entrance to regulate entry and exit. Consequently, the Respondent 1 expressed its inability to identify the alleged individual through its own records or infrastructure. The Respondent 1, however, invited the attention of the Court to paragraph 7 of the complaint, wherein it was stated that several members of the public, including a Delhi Police beat constable present at the spot, had witnessed the incident and had intervened by requesting the individual to cooperate. The Respondent 1 accordingly submitted that the identification of the alleged perpetrator would be more effectively undertaken by the Delhi Police through the concerned beat constable and local investigation. In response, the Complainant submitted that no security personnel were present inside the park at the time of the incident and that, although his statement had been recorded by the Delhi Police, the alleged perpetrator continued to remain unidentified.

2.3 Upon hearing the submissions of both the parties, the Court observed that the safety, dignity, and equal enjoyment of public spaces by persons with disabilities, particularly children with disabilities, are integral components of the rights guaranteed under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. The Court expressed serious concern over the absence of surveillance infrastructure in a public park maintained by the DDA, observing that the complete lack of CCTV coverage significantly hampers the ability of authorities to investigate incidents of harassment, intimidation, or discrimination occurring in such public spaces. The Court observed that the absence of basic monitoring infrastructure cannot become a justification for institutional inability to identify offenders or effectively respond to

grievances involving vulnerable individuals.

2.4 The Court further observed that the creation of accessible and inclusive public spaces extends beyond physical accessibility and necessarily includes institutional measures to ensure the safety and security of persons with disabilities. Had appropriate surveillance mechanisms been available, the identity of the alleged perpetrator could have been ascertained promptly, thereby facilitating a timely investigation and reducing the hardship suffered by the Complainant and his family. While acknowledging the practical and administrative challenges involved in providing surveillance infrastructure across all public parks under the DDA's jurisdiction, the Court emphasized that the Respondent 1 should initiate a phased and time-bound programme for the installation of CCTV cameras at public parks, particularly at vulnerable locations, with due regard to public safety and the rights of persons with disabilities.

2 . 5 In view of the foregoing, the Court recommends the Respondent 1 to examine the feasibility of installing CCTV cameras in the concerned park and to formulate an appropriate plan for strengthening surveillance infrastructure in public parks under its jurisdiction in a phased manner. The DDA shall also undertake sensitisation measures for security personnel and park staff to ensure respectful, non-discriminatory, and responsive engagement with persons with disabilities and their families. These sensitisation measures can include multi-media representations of the respectful, non-discriminatory, and responsive engagement with persons with disabilities.

2.6 The Respondent 2 is recommended to conduct a thorough inquiry into the incident by examining all available evidence, including the statement of the concerned constable and any other witnesses present at the location, with a view to identifying the alleged individual and taking appropriate action in accordance with law. The Delhi Police shall submit an Action Taken Report to this Court within 15 days from the date of receipt of this Order.

2.7 The Respondent 1 is advised to comply to the Court's recommendations in two different phases. They are recommended to submit an Action Taken Report for Phase-I within 30 days, indicating the outcome of its examination regarding the installation of CCTV cameras in the concerned park (DDA Park, Dwarka Sector 13), the proposed timeline for implementation, if feasible, and the sensitisation measures undertaken for its personnel. An initial progress report on the analysis and initiation of the installation of the surveillance systems for Phase-II can be

submitted to this Court within 90 days. They are further advised to submit an exclusive Compliance Report for Phase-II within 6 months, indicating the completion of installation of CCTV cameras covering all the blindspots in other 700+ parks. Failure to do so may compel this Court to initiate action as per Sections 89, and 93 of the Act.

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

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner