



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.ccpd.nic.in

CaseNo.14078/1024/2023

In the matter of:

Complainant:

Shri Satyaveer Dagar

Respondent:

The Director,
Post Graduate Institute of Medical Education & Research
Chandigarh

1. Gist of Complaint

1.1 Shri Satyaveer Dagar, filed a complaint dated 15.05.2022 and stated that around 120 Divyang (persons with disabilities) employees working across various departments and institutions at PGI Chandigarh are facing significant difficulties in commuting to and from their workplace. Despite repeatedly raising the issue, no action has been taken by the House Allotment Committee (HAC). The complainant highlights that the non-allotment of on-campus housing, particularly ground floor accommodation, has created serious challenges for these employees. It is further alleged that the HAC has ignored provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016 and relevant Government of India instructions, which mandate preference for PwD employees in ground floor housing, and instead allotted such units to non-disabled employees.

1.2 The complaint also seeks amendment of existing house allotment rules to provide at least 4% reservation for Divyang employees, in line with statutory

provisions. It points out that current rules are outdated and fail to reflect the increased number of PwD employees after the enactment of disability laws. The complainant refers to multiple committee recommendations and government guidelines supporting preferential allotment and reservation for PwD employees, including maintaining separate seniority lists and reserving a fixed percentage of housing. Additionally, the complaint requests removal of provisions favoring wards of deceased or retired employees, earmarking roster points for vacant houses, and prioritizing ground floor accommodation due to lack of lifts in residential complexes, which makes upper floors inaccessible for Divyang employees.

2. Notice issued to the Respondent:

2.1 A Notice dated 01.06.2023 was issued to the Respondent for forwarding their comments on the affidavit within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply by Respondent:

3.1 The Respondent filed their reply dated 28.07.2023 and submitted that under Rule 7 of the House Allotment Rules, a provision of 5% reservation is already in place, which includes Divyang employees along with other eligible categories. It was further stated that a sub-committee had been constituted to examine the demand for a separate 4% reservation specifically for Divyang employees in the allotment of residential accommodation. Additionally, the respondent informed that the demand raised by the PGI Differently Abled Employees Union (PGIDAEU) for 4% reservation in house allotment was under active consideration.

4. Rejoinder by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant filed the rejoinder dated 05.08.2023, it was submitted that despite the respondent's claim of considering the issue of reservation, no concrete decision has been taken for over ten years. The complainant further stated that the respondent has failed to act upon the recommendations made by various committees and has not addressed the issue of preferential allotment of ground floor accommodation to Divyang employees.

4.2 It was also contended that the House Allotment Committee (HAC) has effectively denied preference to Divyang employees. As an example, the case of Dr. Muneer Abaas, a Divyang faculty member eligible for ground floor accommodation, was cited, wherein he was instead allotted a first-floor residence without lift access, highlighting the lack of reasonable

accommodation.

5. Hearing:

5.1 A Hearing was conducted on **17.04.2025** in hybrid mode wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name & Designation of the Parties/Representatives	For Complainant/ Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Satyaveer Dagur	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Ghanshyam Das Sharma- Senior Admin Office	Respondent	Online

5.2 The complainant highlighted issues faced by around 120 persons with disabilities (PwD) employees, including lack of accessible residential accommodation, absence of lifts/ramps, denial of ground-floor housing, and prolonged inaction despite repeated representations. He also clarified that he is an aggrieved person with 48% orthopaedic disability. The respondent submitted that a subcommittee had been constituted, and amendments to housing allotment rules (last revised in 2016) were under consideration, with a 5% discretionary quota currently applicable to PwDs along with other categories. However, timelines for finalization remained uncertain.

5.3 The Court observed that the matter had been pending for a long time and suggested that it should not be delayed further. It issued interim recommendations requiring the complainant to submit details of affected PwD employees within 15 days, and the Respondent to file an Action Taken Report detailing committee actions and the status of proposed amendments. The respondent was also advised to complete the subcommittee process within six weeks and place the matter before the next Governing Body meeting.

6. Hearing:

6.1 A hearing was conducted on **07.04.2026** in hybrid mode wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No	Name & Designation of the Parties/Representatives	For Complainant/ Respondent	Mode of Attendance

.			
1.	Mr. Satyaveer Dagur	Complainant	Online
2.	Mr. Ratan Singh – Sr. Administrative Officer- Vigilance	Respondent	Online

7. Record of proceedings:

7.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant stated that although the issue relating to 4% reservation for persons with disabilities in house allotment rules had been considered, accessibility-related grievances still remained unresolved. He specifically pointed out that certain housing complexes lacked proper accessibility facilities such as lifts and other supportive infrastructure required for persons with disabilities. In response, the representative of PGIMER submitted that the matter regarding reservation in house allotment had been fully complied with and necessary office orders had already been issued. It was further stated that the complainant had also been included as a member of the House Allotment Committee and that the reservation aspect of the complaint stood resolved.

8. Observations and Recommendations:

8.1 The Court has considered the pleadings, submissions made during the hearing, and the material placed on record. It observes that the Complainant's principal grievance regarding 4% reservation for persons with benchmark disabilities in the house allotment policy has been substantially addressed by the Respondent. However, the issue of accessibility of the allotted residential accommodation requires continued attention. The Court reiterates that accessibility is a mandatory obligation under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and forms an integral part of the principles of equal opportunity, non-discrimination, and reasonable accommodation under Sections 3, 20 and 21 of the Act.

8.2 In view of the above, the Court recommends that the Complainant submit, within 15 days, a detailed report identifying all inaccessible features and barriers in the allotted residential premises. Upon receipt of the report, the Respondent may undertake necessary corrective measures to remove the identified barriers within a further 45 days, so that the accessibility-related grievance is addressed within a total period of 60 days. The Court further recommends that the Respondent ensure that employees with benchmark

disabilities are not allotted inaccessible upper-floor accommodation without their consent, undertake a time-bound accessibility audit of all residential complexes, and furnish an Action Taken Report (ATR) to this Court within 90 days, indicating the measures taken to improve accessibility and ensure compliance with the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016. In the event of non-compliance with the above recommendations or failure to furnish the ATR within the stipulated period, the matter shall be liable for further consideration by this Court in accordance with the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016.

9. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities