



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-0071/2026

In the Matter of

Smt. Kavita Singh

...Complainant

Versus

The Managing Director and CEO, Bank of Baroda

..Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Smt. Kavita Singh, submitted a grievance dated 02.07.2026 on behalf of her husband, Shri Sunil Kumar Singh, an employee of Bank of Baroda and an ex-serviceman, stating that he had been transferred to another branch despite being the primary caregiver of their 17-year-old son, who has 75% benchmark disability due to severe mental illness and congenital heart disease requiring continuous medical care. The Complainant submitted that her husband is the sole caregiver of their son and requested cancellation of the transfer and exemption from such transfers in view of their son's disability and medical condition.

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.	Smt. Kavita Singh	Complainant
2.	Shri Sanjay Kumar, Deputy Regional Manager (DRM)	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, Shri Sanjay Kumar, DRM, appearing on behalf of the Respondent, submitted that the transfer of Shri Sunil Kumar Singh had been affected consequent upon his promotion and that the transfer would not adversely affect the medical treatment or rehabilitation of his son. He further submitted that the transferred branch is situated approximately 30 kilometres from the present place of residence and that the employee's residential accommodation would remain unchanged, enabling him to continue commuting daily and providing necessary care to his son. It was also stated that the medical facilities presently being availed by the child would continue to remain accessible.

3.2 The Court sought clarification regarding the impact of the transfer on the child's treatment and noted the Respondent's submission that the transfer was within the same city and would not materially affect the employee's ability to discharge his caregiving responsibilities.

3.3 The Court further observed that the present complaint had been instituted by the employee's spouse. It was explained that the grievance pertains to a service matter concerning the transfer of an employee and, therefore, the aggrieved employee himself is the proper person to institute and pursue such proceedings before this Court. The Court observed that a third party cannot maintain a complaint in respect of an individual service grievance of an employee. The Court also noted that the transfer involved a distance of approximately 30 kilometres within the same city and that such transfer, in the facts and circumstances of the present case, did not appear to substantially interfere with the employee's ability to continue residing at the same place or providing care to his son.

3.4 In view of the above, the Court found that the present complaint is not maintainable, both on account of the Complainant lacking the requisite locus to pursue the service grievance on behalf of her husband and because no prima facie case of denial of rights under the *Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016* was made out against the Respondent. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities