



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

Case No: CCPD-AD-0058/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Manoj Kumar Sahu

Versus

Respondent

The Chief Executive Officer, Indian Institute of Banking and Finance (IIBF)

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.	Shri Manoj Kumar Sahu	Complainant
2.	Smt. Hema Jain, Joint Director (Examination)	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Manoj Kumar Sahu, a person with locomotor disability, submitted a grievance dated 10.06.2026, against the Chief Executive Officer, Indian Institute of Banking and Finance (IIBF). He submitted that although his examination centre was changed upon his request due to accessibility concerns, the new venue also lacked proper accessibility as the lift was non-functional on the day of the examination. As a result, he had to crawl up the stairs to reach the second floor without any assistance, which left him physically exhausted and

severely affected his concentration during the examination. He further alleged that the computer system allotted to him suffered from a technical glitch causing the screen to repeatedly black out, and despite informing the staff and requesting a system change, he was merely advised to repeatedly press the escape key. The Complainant contended that these cumulative hardships adversely impacted his performance, causing him to secure 49 marks and fall short of the passing mark of 50 by just one mark. Accordingly, he requested that the IIBF be advised to grant him one grace mark to enable him to pass the examination.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted a point-wise clarification. Regarding the venue, the Respondent stated that IIBF mandates its vendors to ensure that examination centers are PwBD-friendly, and the vendor had explicitly shifted the Complainant to the new center on 30th May 2026 specifically because it possessed a lift. However, on the evening of 6th June 2026, a severe unpredicted storm ("Kal Baisakhi") hit the Odisha area, causing a power failure that temporarily disabled the lift. The Respondent maintained that technical staff worked diligently to resolve the unforeseen issue, and the lift became operational at 9:10 AM, prior to the 9:30 AM exam start time. The Respondent noted that the Complainant chose to ascend the staircase independently rather than waiting for the lift to be restored. Regarding the technical glitch, the Respondent argued that the venue in-charge inspected the Complainant's PC at 9:32 AM and found no major technical fault, noting that the Complainant subsequently answered all 100 questions, was granted 40 minutes of mandatory extra time, and manually submitted his paper at 126 minutes without raising further alarms. The Respondent further clarified that IIBF maintains a uniform evaluation policy and does not have any provision for relaxing cutoff standards or granting grace marks to any category of candidates.

2.3 The Court observed that traveling up several floors due to a non-functional lift causes immense distress, depression, and physical strain to candidates with benchmark disabilities, which naturally undermines their ability to perform fairly in competitive examinations. The Court emphasized that relying on lifts or technical mechanisms does not constitute a fail-safe accessibility strategy for PwBD candidates. The Court advised that a permanent solution must be institutionalized by examination-conducting bodies, whereby rooms for candidates with disabilities are strictly and exclusively arranged on the ground floor of any allotted venue to eliminate architectural barriers entirely.

2.4 The Court subsequently noted that a multi-stage corrective timeline be executed within a mutually agreed timeframe, wherein the Respondent shall, within the first stage, formally confirm the schedule, venue, and logistical details of a fresh re-examination to this Court and the Complainant at no additional cost; following

which, within the subsequent phase, the Respondent shall ensure strict compliance with all statutory accessibility standards and comfortable seating arrangements, allowing the Complainant to utilize this fresh opportunity to prove his capability under proper and convenient conditions.

2.5 The Respondent is advised to host a fully accessible re-examination for the Complainant and ensure that all future examination arrangements strictly prioritize ground-floor seating for persons with disabilities. Subsequently, the respondent is further advised to submit an Action Taken Report and a redressal report to this court within 30 days from the date of this order.

2.6 Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities