

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-0030/2026

In the matter of—

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Vyas
(Complainant)

Versus

The Chairman
 Prasar Bharti, New Delhi
 Email: chairman@prasarbharati.gov.in
(Respondents)

Hearing:

A preliminary hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 15.06.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/ Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Vyas	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Jitendra Arora DDG (Programme & HR), Akashvani Directorate, New Delhi	For Respondent	Online

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The complainant, Shri Sanjeev Kumar Vyas, stated that he is a person with 50% hearing impairment and alleged that he had been subjected to mental harassment, discrimination, humiliation and insulting remarks by certain senior officers and staff at his workplace. He also raised grievances regarding his working conditions. He further stated that, due to these issues, he was undergoing treatment with a psychiatrist at Jaipur. He alleged that, despite raising the matter

before the concerned authorities, no redressal had been provided.

2. Shri Jitendra Arora, DDG (Programme&HR), Akashvani, New Delhi, appearing on behalf of the Respondent, stated that an inquiry into the complaint was underway and that some further time would be required to examine the allegations and complete the inquiry. He informed the Court that Shri Rajesh Kumar, DDG, was the designated Grievance Redressal Officer (GRO). On being asked whether the complainant had approached the GRO, the complainant stated that he was not aware of the designated GRO and had raised the matter before the DDG, but had not specifically approached the designated GRO. The Respondent further stated that an interim report in the matter had been received and that further examination was in progress. On being asked about the dissemination of the details of the GRO, the Respondent stated that the details of the GRO had been made available on the e-Office notice board.

3. The Court observed that the allegations made by the complainant, particularly those relating to harassment, insulting remarks, verbal mocking and discriminatory treatment of a person with disability, were of a serious nature and should not be treated lightly. The Court also sought clarification regarding the appointment of the GRO and the dissemination of his details, and whether the employees had been duly informed of the same.

4. Since the complainant had not specifically approached the designated GRO, he was advised to formally register his grievance before the GRO. The GRO was directed to examine and redress the grievance **within 14 days**. In the event of failure to provide appropriate redressal within the stipulated period, the complainant would be at liberty to approach this Court again.

5. Accordingly, the complaint is not admitted at this stage and is closed with the above observations, with liberty to the complainant to seek further remedy before the Court if the grievance remained unresolved. The Respondent is also advised to deal with such allegations concerning persons with disabilities with due sensitivity and seriousness.

The matter is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner