



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-0092/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Ms. Sandhya Vasanta Ade

Versus

Respondent

The Secretary, Department of Posts

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Ms. Sandhya Vasanta Ade, a person with 100% hearing impairment (Deaf and Hard of Hearing), submitted a grievance regarding the Grameen Dak Sevak (GDS) recruitment in the Maharashtra Circle. She alleged that despite securing 82.20% marks in her Class 10th (SSC) examination and being eligible under the Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (PwBD) reservation category, her name was not included in the final merit list. She expressed concern over whether her application and reservation status were processed correctly and requested a detailed review of her non-selection.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 15.07.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Kumar Meena, Section Officer, Reservation Cell, Department of Posts Directorate	Respondent

2.	Ms. Sakshi Poojari, Assistant Superintendent of Posts (ASP) Legal	Respondent
3.	Shri Gurvinder Singh, GDS Section, Department of Posts Directorate	Respondent
4.	Shri Gajanan Desai	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the representatives of the Respondent submitted that the selection of GDS candidates is handled through an entirely automated, transparent online recruitment portal. It was clarified that the merit score is system-calculated based on the total marks obtained by the candidate across all subjects in the SSC examination, rather than a selective "best five" subjects.

3.2 Furthermore, upon cross-verifying the records, the Respondent pointed out that while the Complainant calculated her percentage as 82.20% based on her best five subjects, her total percentage across all compulsory subjects is actually 76.50%. Consequently, she did not meet the required merit cutoff for the position.

3.3 Subsequently, when questioned by the Court regarding the exact minimum cutoff and the classification of PwBD reservation sub-categories (namely PwBD-A, B, and C) within the GDS recruitment portal, the Respondent's representatives initially struggled to provide definitive administrative data, citing that the cutoff marks vary across post-offices based on local online demand. Upon further directions, the Respondent confirmed that PwBD-B designates the "Deaf and Hard of Hearing" category to which the Complainant belongs.

3.4 The Court observed that while recruitment is processed through an automated online system, the administration must maintain absolute clarity regarding cutoff percentages, category-wise relaxations, and reserved roster vacancies to ensure that PwBD candidates are not left with arbitrary justifications for non-selection.

3.5 The Court also observed that the lack of clear and accessible data significantly hampers transparency, noting that automation cannot excuse the administrative responsibility to provide precise verification of eligibility and cut-offs for vulnerable applicants. The Court advises the Respondent to ensure systemic transparency in its automated recruitment procedures and establish standard

operational mechanisms to readily provide category-wise cut-off information for all candidates with disabilities.

3.6 The Respondent is recommended to submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report (ATR) to this Court within 7 days from the date of this order. The ATR must clearly outline the specific marks secured by the Complainant, the final merit cut-off of the selected candidate under the PwBD-B (Deaf and Hard of Hearing) category for the respective post, and a detailed clarification of the reservation matrix applied. Failure to do so may compel this Court to initiate action as per sections 89 and 93 of the Act. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities