



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/0061/2026

In the Matter of

Ms. Swati Sharma

...Complainant

Versus

The Chairman, Staff Selection Commission

...Respondent

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 30.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Ms. Swati Sharma	Complainant
2.	Mrs. Anju Sharma	Complainant
3.	Mr. Prakash, Under Secy	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Ms. Swati Sharma, a person with 75% visual impairment, submitted a grievance against the Skill Test of the SSC Combined Graduate Level (CGL) Examination, 2025, conducted on 18.01.2026. She submitted that the scribe allocated to her by the Respondent was fundamentally unskilled and incompetent, failing to dictate the passage properly, struggling with basic English pronunciations (for example: pronouncing “were” as “where” and spelling out the words incorrectly), and abruptly stopping before the text was fully completed. She

contended that she was completely denied permission by the examination centre to utilize her own qualified scribe. Consequently, she secured a score of 43% in the test, which disqualified her from her preferred post allocations (specifically Post B-048, Central Excise Duty), which mandated a stricter 10% error-rate cutoff. Despite escalating the issue to the invigilator on duty during the active window, no effective institutional assistance or redressal was afforded.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent establishment, represented by the Staff Selection Commission Northern Region (SSCNR), raised strong preliminary objections regarding the admissibility and maintainability of the complaint, highlighting a significant delay of over three months in the formal escalation of the grievance post-examination. The Respondent maintained that the examination centre analyzed the relevant CCTV parameters and noted that no active written objection was filed by the candidate at the starting minute of the skill test. The Respondent further argued that its administrative actions regarding the allocation of centre-arranged scribes were executed under general directives, referencing evolving framework considerations before the Hon'ble Supreme Court for subsequent examination cycles.

2.3 The Court observed that a procedural delay in submitting a written complaint post-results does not abscond or absolve an examination conducting body of its core statutory responsibilities to ensure structural accessibility. The Court noted multiple prima facie systemic discrepancies by the Respondent authority, specifically the lack of any statutory rule or Office Memorandum empowering the facility to enforce an absolute structural bar prohibiting a candidate from using their own qualified scribe. Furthermore, the Respondent admitted to completely bypassing the mandatory statutory guidelines requiring the candidate and the centre-arranged scribe to be introduced at least two (2) days prior to the examination day to ensure basic compatibility. Since an administrative body enforcing rigid compliance must itself demonstrate strict adherence to guidelines designed to provide a level playing field, no presumption of compliance can be permitted when core accessibility rules are visibly bypassed.

2.4 The Respondent is hereby advised to conduct a comprehensive internal enquiry and submit a detailed written submission to this Court within fifteen (15) days of the issuance of this order, explicitly outlining a proper justification and the specific remedial framework that can be legally provided to compensate for the performance loss suffered by the candidate.

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

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner