



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-0089/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Rajendra Chhetri

Versus

Respondent

The Secretary, Ministry of Railways

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 Rajendra Chhetri	Complainant
2.	Shri Sanjay Manocha, DPM-II	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2 . 1 The Complainant, Shri Rajendra Chhetri, a person with 50% benchmark locomotor disability and a resident of Assam, submitted a grievance alleging that his online application for issuance of a Railway Concession Identity Card had been repeatedly rejected by the concerned divisional authorities. He submitted that despite complying with the prescribed procedure, rectifying the deficiencies indicated from time to time, and repeatedly uploading all requisite documents,

including a valid disability certificate and concession certificate duly certified by the competent medical authority, his application continued to be rejected through the online portal. The Complainant further submitted that the portal did not disclose any specific reason for rejection or indicate the precise deficiencies requiring rectification, thereby preventing him from availing the travel concession benefits available to persons with benchmark disabilities.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent, represented by Shri Sanjay Manocha, submitted that the issuance of Railway Concession Identity Cards is administered by the concerned Zonal Railway and Divisional Railway authorities. It was submitted that, in the present case, no representative from the Northeast Frontier Railway (NFR) or Rangiya Division was present during the hearing and, therefore, the precise reasons for the repeated rejection of the Complainant's application could not be immediately ascertained. The Respondent further submitted that, based on the available records, the concerned division appeared to have sought an updated medical certificate, although the necessity for such a requirement would have to be verified with the competent divisional authorities.

2.3 The Complainant submitted that his applications were processed through the Rangiya Division and that the online portal merely reflected the status of "rejected" without specifying any reasons or deficiencies requiring compliance. The Respondent, in response, submitted that the Ministry of Railways has issued instructions to the field formations requiring that, wherever an application is rejected, the reasons for such rejection should be clearly communicated to the applicant through the online system to facilitate compliance, wherever applicable.

2.4 Upon consideration of the submissions made by the parties, the Court observed that effective communication of the reasons for rejection is an essential component of a fair and transparent administrative process, particularly where the applicant is seeking statutory benefits available to persons with disabilities. In the absence of the concerned divisional authority, the factual basis for the repeated rejection of the Complainant's application could not be verified during the present proceedings. The Court, therefore, deemed it appropriate to afford the Respondents an opportunity to examine the matter with the Northeast Frontier Railway, Rangiya Division, ascertain the reasons for the repeated rejection, and take appropriate action in accordance with the applicable rules and policies.

2.5 Accordingly, the Respondent is recommended to coordinate with the concerned Zonal and Divisional Railway authorities, examine the grievance raised

by the Complainant, and submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report (ATR) within 30 days, indicating

- i. the reasons for the repeated rejection of the Complainant's application;
- ii. whether the deficiencies, if any, have been duly communicated to the Complainant;
- iii. the action taken to facilitate processing of the application in accordance with the applicable rules; and
- iv. the present status of the issuance of the Railway Concession Identity Card.

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

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner