



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-0091/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Madan Thakur

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Principal, DAV School, Dwarka
2. The Chairman, Central Board of Secondary Education

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, the father of Saumyaa Thakur, a child with Specific Learning Disability (SLD), submitted a grievance dated 07.07.2026 alleging that his daughter was not granted admission to Class IX at DAV Public School, Dwarka, under the Children with Special Needs (CwSN) category. He stated that his daughter has a valid disability certificate and is eligible for admission under the CwSN quota as per the CBSE guidelines and the RPwD Act, 2016. He further alleged that despite visiting the school, he was not allowed to meet the Principal or the Admission In-charge to discuss the matter. He requested that his daughter be granted admission in accordance with the applicable CBSE and Government guidelines and be provided equal educational opportunities in an inclusive environment.

2. Hearing

2.1. 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 /	On Behalf of
---------	-----------------------	--------------

	Representatives	
1.	Shri Madan Thakur	Complainant
2.	Smt. Sarika Pant, Principal	Respondent

2.2 No representative on behalf of the Respondent 2 was present during the proceedings.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant reiterated his grievance. The Respondent 1, represented by its principal, submitted that the school follows an inclusive education policy and presently has more than thirty students with disabilities enrolled. It was clarified that no admissions had been granted to Class IX during the current academic session, irrespective of category, as the sanctioned strength prescribed under the CBSE Affiliation Bye-laws had already been exhausted. The Respondent further submitted that admissions to Class IX are considered only against available vacancies and, since no vacancy existed, no candidate had been admitted, whether under the general category or otherwise. With regard to the allegation that the Complainant was not permitted to meet the school authorities, it was submitted that the Complainant had been responded to through email and, in the absence of available seats, entry to the campus was regulated by the security personnel.

3.2 The Court considered the submissions advanced by both parties. Upon examination of the material placed on record, the Court observed that the Respondent 1 has categorically stated that no admissions to Class IX were made during the relevant academic session on account of the absence of vacancies and the requirement to adhere to the sanctioned student strength prescribed under the applicable CBSE Affiliation Bye-laws. The Court further noted that there is nothing on record to indicate that admission was denied to the Complainant's daughter solely on the ground of her disability or that similarly situated candidates were granted admission in excess of the sanctioned strength.

3.3 The Court further observed that the statutory mandate of providing access to inclusive education under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 cannot be construed as requiring a school to admit students beyond its sanctioned intake capacity or in contravention of the applicable regulatory framework. In the absence of any vacancy in Class IX and in the absence of any material establishing discriminatory treatment on the ground of disability, the Court finds no violation of the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities