



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-0026/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Pintu

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 Pintu	Complainant
2.	Shri Sanjay Manocha, DPM-II	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2 . 1 The Complainant, Shri Pintu, a person with 40% benchmark disability, submitted a grievance dated 05.06.2026 alleging that Indian Railways does not provide reserved seats or berths for Persons with Disabilities (PwDs) in certain premium classes of trains, including AC First Class (1A), AC Two Tier (2A), Executive Class (EC) of Vande Bharat Express, and Shatabdi Express. The Complainant submitted that the absence of reservation facilities in these classes

causes hardship to passengers with disabilities and is inconsistent with the objectives of accessibility, equality, and reasonable accommodation envisaged under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. He accordingly requested that reservation facilities be extended to PwDs across all classes of trains.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted that Indian Railways presently provides reservation facilities for Persons with Disabilities in Sleeper Class, AC Three Tier (3A), Second Sitting (2S), AC Chair Car (CC), and SLRD coaches of Vande Bharat Express. It was further submitted that the utilization of the existing quota over the past three years has remained in the range of approximately 56%, indicating that the presently available reservation facilities are being adequately utilized. The Respondent further submitted that premium classes such as AC First Class (1A) have a limited number of berths, making earmarking of a separate quota operationally difficult.

2 . 3 In response, the Complainant submitted that the absence of reservation facilities in premium classes places Persons with Disabilities at a disadvantage, particularly those requiring greater accessibility or medical support during travel. The Complainant further highlighted that AC Three Tier Economy (3E) coaches, which are increasingly being introduced in place of conventional AC Three Tier (3A) coaches, presently do not provide reservation facilities for Persons with Disabilities. It was suggested that the Respondent examine the feasibility of extending reservation benefits to such classes while ensuring efficient utilization of available accommodation.

2 . 4 The Court considered the submissions advanced by both parties. While noting the operational concerns expressed by the Respondent with respect to classes having limited accommodation, the Court observed that the issues raised by the Complainant concerning reservation facilities in AC Two Tier (2A) and AC Three Tier Economy (3E) merit examination from the perspective of accessibility and reasonable accommodation under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. During the proceedings, the Respondent agreed to examine the feasibility of extending reservation facilities to the aforesaid classes in accordance with the applicable rules and operational requirements.

2.5 Accordingly, the Respondent is recommended to undertake a detailed examination of the issues raised by the Complainant, including the feasibility of providing reservation facilities for Persons with Disabilities in AC Two Tier (2A) and AC Three Tier Economy (3E) coaches, and to submit an Action Taken Report (ATR) before this Court within 15 days, clearly indicating the outcome of such

examination together with point-wise reasons and the policy considerations governing the decision.

3. This is issued with the approval of the Hon'ble Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities.

(Vikas Trivedi)
Dy. Chief Commissioner