



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-0145/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Sohit Rai

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Managing Director and CEO, Central Bank of India

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Mr. Sohit Rai, a person with 70% locomotor disability, submitted a grievance dated 06.08.2026 and contested that he successfully completed his apprenticeship at the Central Bank of India from 1 August 2024 to 31 July 2025 under the Apprentices Act, 1961. During the apprenticeship, he gained practical banking experience and performed his duties sincerely. He stated that after completing the apprenticeship, the bank does not provide any preference, age relaxation, or other concessions to former apprentice candidates with disabilities in future recruitment processes for posts such as Clerk and Probationary Officer (PO). He alleged that despite having relevant work experience, persons with disabilities who have completed apprenticeships are not given any advantage, which affects their right to equal opportunity under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act, 2016. The complainant has requested the Chief Commissioner to direct the Central Bank of India to consider giving preference or appropriate concessions to former apprentice candidates with disabilities in future recruitment processes and to make suitable provisions to ensure equal opportunities for persons with disabilities.

2. Notice of Hearing

2.1 A Notice dated 07.08.2026 under sections 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons

with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPwD Act, 2016) was issued to the above-mentioned respondent for a hearing on 12.08.2026 in Hybrid mode to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this can be resolved without a quasi-judicial intervention of this Court.

3. Respondent's Submission

3.1 The Respondent, Central Bank of India, submitted a reply vide letter dated 10.08.2026 contesting that completion of apprenticeship training does not confer any automatic right to regular employment, absorption, preference, reservation, age relaxation or exemption from the prescribed recruitment process. It relied upon Section 18 and Section 22 of the Apprentices Act, 1961, the Bank's Apprenticeship Policy dated 01.11.2021, and the judgment of the Hon'ble Delhi High Court dated 24.11.2025 in W.P.(C) No. 11819/2024, wherein a similar claim by apprentices was rejected.

3.2 The Bank stated that its apprenticeship terms expressly provide that an apprentice has no right to claim employment after completion of training and that recruitment to regular posts is governed by the applicable recruitment policy and selection process. It, however, clarified that eligible Persons with Disabilities would continue to receive all reservation, relaxation and other statutory benefits available under the applicable recruitment rules and notification. The Bank accordingly denied any discrimination against the Complainant on the ground of disability and submitted that his request for a separate preferential recruitment channel merely on the basis of having completed apprenticeship was not legally sustainable.

4. Hearing

4.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 12.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Sohit Rai	Complainant
2.	Mr. Avinash Kumar, Deputy General Manager, HCM	Respondent
3.	Mr. Muralikrishnan S., Chief Manager, HCM	Respondent
4.	Ms. Vidula Ramteke, Manager, HCM	Respondent

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted that apprenticeship is intended primarily for skill development and structured training and does not, by itself, create any right to regular employment or absorption. It was stated that the terms of apprenticeship specifically provide that the Bank is not obligated to offer regular employment upon completion of the training. The Respondent further submitted that recruitment to regular posts is governed by the applicable recruitment policy, which presently does not provide any separate preference or weightage to apprentices. The Respondent, however, submitted that the matter could be taken up with the Indian Banks' Association (IBA) for consideration of any additional weightage or relaxation for apprentices in future recruitment, subject to consensus among the Public Sector Banks.

5.2 The Court observed that, in terms of Section 18 of the Apprentices Act, 1961, an apprentice is a trainee and not a worker, and the statutory scheme of apprenticeship is primarily intended to facilitate training and skill development. The Court further observed that Section 22 of the Apprentices Act, 1961 provides that every apprentice who has completed the period of apprenticeship training shall not be bound to accept employment under the employer, nor shall the employer be bound to offer employment, unless the contract of apprenticeship contains a provision regarding such employment. Accordingly, apprenticeship does not, by itself, guarantee regular employment or absorption.

5.3 The Court, however, took note of the positive submission of the Respondent that the matter could be recommended before the IBA for consideration of additional weightage in the recruitment process or prioritisation of apprentices. The Court observed that such an initiative, if taken forward by the Respondent with the IBA, may constitute a positive step towards recognising the training and experience acquired through apprenticeship.

5.4 The Court noted that no statutory or mandatory right to preference, weightage or reservation in regular recruitment merely on the basis of completion of apprenticeship was established in the present proceedings. The Complainant would accordingly be required to participate in the regular recruitment process along with other eligible candidates and would be entitled to the applicable reservation and other statutory benefits available to persons with disabilities under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, subject to fulfilment of the prescribed eligibility conditions. In the event of any denial of such statutory benefits, the Complainant would be at liberty to pursue an appropriate remedy before the competent forum. In view of the above, the Court does not consider

further intervention necessary at this stage.

6. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities