



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-0095/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Ajit Kumar

Versus

Respondent

The Managing Director and CEO, IDBI Bank

1. Hearing

1.1. 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 Ajit Kumar	Complainant
2.	Advocate Kriti Majumdar	Complainant
3.	General Manager, IDBI Bank	Respondent
4.	Shri Manish, Deputy General Manager (DGM), IDBI Bank	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Ajit Kumar, a person with 45% locomotor disability following a workplace accident on 23.08.2018, who joined the bank as an Assistant

Manager in 2009 and currently serves as an Assistant General Manager (AGM), submitted a grievance regarding discriminatory treatment and service irregularities by the Respondent bank. The Complainant alleged that despite his tenure, he has faced an arbitrary transfer from Bokaro to a remote location in Dhanbad causing physical and financial hardship, withholding of eligible medical reimbursements for his 2025 surgery, adverse performance grading (PG 5), and subsequent harassment through staff accountability disciplinary actions and a recent suspension order dated April 2026. He expressed concern over these actions and requested a detailed review, noting that prior conciliation proceedings before the Assistant Labor Commissioner, Dhanbad, failed on 16.06.2026 due to non-cooperation by the bank.

2.2 During the proceedings, the representatives of the Respondent submitted that the Complainant has enjoyed robust career progression, moving up to Grade B (Manager) in 2014 and AGM in 2021. Regarding the medical claims, it was clarified that the bank adhered to its standard medical schedule, disbursing a proportionate settlement of approximately ₹1 lakh against a final hospital bill of ₹2.8 lakhs (against an initial estimate of ₹5.77 lakhs and a maximum cap of ₹2.5 lakhs).

2.3 Furthermore, the Respondent justified the disciplinary actions as standard administrative procedures handled uniformly across nine separate accountability cases, stating that the current suspension followed an internal investigation into an alleged physical assault on a fellow officer. Regarding the performance appraisal, the Respondent clarified that following a grievance redressal mechanism, the Complainant's annual performance review for 2023–24 was upgraded from PG 5 to PG 4 by an Executive Director-level Committee, which found no evidence of discrimination.

2 . 4 Consequently, when questioned by the Court regarding the exact administrative necessity of the transfer from Bokaro to Dhanbad, the Respondent's representatives pointed out that the Complainant had completed over five years at the Bokaro branch and his transfer to a metro-classified branch in Dhanbad was required due to a scarcity of matching administrative profiles in Bokaro. Upon further discussion, the Complainant reiterated that traveling a daily distance of 40 to 50 kilometres in his condition poses extreme physical and financial hardship, especially since his residence and family are rooted in Bokaro.

2 . 5 The Court observed that while internal service disputes, performance matrices, and disciplinary inquiries fall squarely within the bank's internal

administrative affairs, with which the Court declines to interfere the administration must adhere strictly to statutory principles governing the RPwD Act, 2016.

2.6 The Court also observed that routine or rotational transfers are not strictly applicable to persons with benchmark disabilities, and while administrative exigencies permit specialized deployment, employers must extend the privilege of choice and prioritize physical convenience based on the employee's disability status. The Court noted that the failure to actively safeguard these conveniences significantly hampers the statutory rights of the individual, emphasizing that routine guidelines cannot override the institutional obligation to provide reasonable accommodation and reduce hardship for personnel with disabilities.

2.7 The Court advises the Respondent to review its transfer policies for persons with benchmark disabilities and establish protective measures to ensure assignments are executed with maximum consideration for physical convenience and accessibility.

2.8 The Respondent is advised to submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report (ATR), and written representation to this Court within fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of this Order. The representation must clearly outline a formal review of the Complainant's transfer order, ensuring the Respondent either retains the Complainant at his preferred station in Bokaro or explicitly defines a limited, short-term operational timeline for any unavoidable exigency deployment, after which he must be restored to his choice location, and provide a detailed supporting record concerning all contested service and medical claims.

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

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner