



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-0120/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Asheesh Bansal

Versus

Respondent

The General Manager, Punjab & Sind 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 Asheesh Bansal	Complainant
2.	Shri Rajesh Bandhu, Chief General Manager (CGM) HR, Punjab & Sind Bank	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Asheesh Bansal, a Senior Manager in Punjab & Sind Bank and a person with a 50% locomotor disability, submitted a grievance alleging continuous harassment and discrimination by the Zonal Manager due to his disability. The Complainant submitted that he was issued unfair show cause notices, including a major allegation regarding twelve (12) missing loan files issued two months after he was relieved from the branch. He further alleged that he

was forced to join duty despite being hospitalized until 20.09.2025 and advised ten (10) days of bed rest, during which period he was threatened with disciplinary action if he did not resume duty. Additionally, he stated that he was humiliated in meetings, his performance was ignored, and a ₹20 crore loan proposal he had worked on for three to four months was shifted to another branch on the verge of sanctioning, affecting his performance record. He also alleged receiving a backdated assignment letter on 02.02.2026 (dated 03.01.2026) demanding an explanation for one month of unperformed work, and that his leave applied from 19.01.2026 to 26.03.2026 was neither approved nor rejected.

2.2 During the proceedings, the representative of the Respondent submitted that a fact-finding inquiry had been ordered by the head office, and a fact-finding officer was deputed to investigate the allegations. It was clarified that the inquiry officer submitted a report concluding that the contested actions fell under normal administrative and supervisory functions rather than selective harassment.

2.3 Consequently, the head office closed the complaint internally and sent a letter to the Complainant to that effect. The Respondent further clarified that the Complainant's transfer was within the same city and did not constitute a grievance, and that the performance appraisal and administrative letters were issued uniformly in accordance with standard records.

2 . 4 Furthermore, the Complainant stated that the inquiry officer ignored his date-wise documented proofs and submissions. When questioned by the Court regarding whether he had raised these specific grievances internally with the bank's designated Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO), the Complainant confirmed that he had submitted his complaints to the GRO with a copy to this Court, but received only a generalized reply stating that such actions occur in the routine course of work. The Respondent confirmed that the General Manager (GM) HR has been formally appointed as the bank's GRO.

2 . 5 The Court observed that while routine administrative functions and supervisory actions fall under internal management, allegations of targeted harassment, backdated assignments, and disregard for medical advice of a person with a benchmark disability require a meticulous and transparent internal grievance process. The Court noted that a general or routine inquiry report cannot resolve such detailed grievances and that the GRO must actively demonstrate how the specific concerns of the Complainant were addressed.

2.6 The Respondent is advised to submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report (ATR) and written representation to this Court within fourteen (14) days from the date of this hearing. The representation must clearly outline the specific findings of the GRO regarding the Complainant's allegations, specifically the backdated assignment letter, the withholding of medical leaves during hospitalization, the handling of the missing files inquiry, and the transfer of the major loan proposal, providing detailed point-wise reasoning and clarifications for each grievance. Upon analysis on this written submission, the Court will determine the next course of action.

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

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner