



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-0043/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Manohar Kumar Gupta

Versus

Respondent

The Director, National Remote Sensing Centre

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 20.07.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Manohar Kumar Gupta	Complainant
2.	Shri Ankur Srivastava, Controller	Respondent
3.	Shri Uday Kumar, Sr. ADO	Respondent
4.	Shri Pawan Kumar, Sr. ADO	Respondent
5.	Shri Kishor, Technical Team	Respondent
6.	Shri Ramaprasad, Technical Team	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, a person with locomotor disability, applied for the post of

Scientist/Engineer (Urban Studies – Post Code 24) under the recruitment notification dated May 10, 2025, issued by the National Remote Sensing Centre (NRSC), against a vacancy reserved for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (PwBD). He alleged, in his written grievance, that despite fulfilling the essential qualification criteria and securing 61.47% marks in the written Computer Based Test (CBT), which was above the qualifying benchmark and cutoff, he was arbitrarily rejected and not called for the interview. The Complainant further alleged that the Respondent provided contradictory and inconsistent justifications through RTI replies and representations, initially stating that he lacked essential qualifications and later claiming that he had uploaded an MA in Economics degree instead of the required Postgraduate degree in Regional Planning. Contending that he had uploaded his valid M.Plan (Regional Planning) credentials and was denied a reasonable opportunity to clarify any alleged deficiency before rejection, the Complainant sought verification of his portal records and appropriate relief regarding his candidature.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by officials of the National Remote Sensing Centre (NRSC), submitted that there was no act of discrimination on the grounds of disability, noting that out of seven advertised posts under Post Code 24, one post was exclusively reserved for PwBD candidates, against which a qualified PwBD candidate had already been selected and recruited. It was stated that as per the recruitment advertisement, the essential qualification for Post Code 24 was M.E./M.Tech/M.Arch/M.Plan in Urban Planning or Regional Planning with B.Tech/B.Arch, whereas the backend digital records of the Complainant's final submitted online application contained an MA in Economics degree from IGNOU, which failed to satisfy the essential eligibility criteria. The Respondent further submitted that initial admission to the CBT was purely provisional based on the applicant's self-declaration, as explicitly notified under Para 10(B) of the recruitment advertisement, and that seven non-PwD candidates were similarly disqualified on identical grounds of non-eligibility during document scrutiny.

2.3 The Court observed that keeping applications purely provisional and allowing candidates to sit for examinations without initial scrutiny creates avoidable confusion, administrative burden, and distress for candidates. The Court further observed that while a candidate cannot claim eligibility if improper qualification documents were uploaded on the portal, physical verification during the hearing revealed that the Complainant does, in fact, possess a valid M.Plan in Regional Planning degree awarded by the School of Planning and Architecture, New Delhi in November 2019. Consequently, the Court noted that it was necessary to examine the exact documents uploaded on the recruitment portal to determine whether a

technical misupload or error had occurred.

2.4 The Respondent is recommended to furnish, within seven days, complete copies and portal records of all application files and uploaded documents as received in respect of the Complainant, both to the Complainant and to the Court. Upon receipt of the Respondent's submission, the Complainant shall be at liberty to file a rejoinder within three days thereafter, following which the Court shall examine the records and pass final orders in the matter.

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner