



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-0081/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Soumen Paul

Versus

Respondent

The Chairman, Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT)

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 13.07.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Soumen Paul	Complainant
2.	Ms. Seema Bharti, ADIT (CMD-1 & RC), HRD	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Soumen Paul, submitted that he had appeared in the SSC Combined Graduate Level Examination, 2025, and challenged the decision of the Central Board of Direct Taxes (CBDT) declaring the post of Office Superintendent unsuitable for persons with mental illness through a corrigendum dated 05.03.2026. The Complainant alleged that the exclusion had been made without obtaining the mandatory approval of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) or issuing the requisite notification under the

Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. It was further contended that the exclusion lacked any supporting expert committee report or job analysis, as revealed through information obtained under the Right to Information Act, 2005. Accordingly, the Complainant sought setting aside of the corrigendum and requested that the post of Office Superintendent be treated as identified and suitable for candidates with mental illness in accordance with the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016 and the DEPwD Guidelines dated 08.11.2024.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by Ms. Seema Bharti, ADIT (CMD-1 & RC), HRD, submitted that the notice of hearing had not been received by the concerned office in sufficient time to enable preparation of the case. It was stated that although the communication had been received by the CBDT, the same had not been marked to the concerned coordinating officer, thereby preventing adequate preparation and collection of the relevant records. The Respondent, therefore, requested that the matter be adjourned for a reasonable period to enable filing of a comprehensive response.

2.3 The Court observed that administrative delays within the Respondent organisation or the official engagements of the concerned officer cannot ordinarily constitute sufficient grounds for postponement of quasi-judicial proceedings. Nevertheless, considering the Respondent's submission that adequate opportunity had not been available to prepare the case and in the interest of ensuring a fair adjudication, the Court deemed it appropriate to grant one final opportunity to the Respondent to file its response.

2.4 The Respondent is granted a final opportunity to file its comprehensive written response along with all relevant documents pertaining to the issues raised in the complaint. The matter is adjourned and shall be listed for hearing on **12.08.2026** as recommended by the Court. No further adjournment shall be granted on the ground of administrative inconvenience or lack of preparedness on the part of the Respondent.

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner