



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-0160/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Mahavir Godara

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Managing Director and Chief Executive Officer, Punjab National Bank

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Mahavir Godara, a person with benchmark locomotor disability submitted a grievance dated 11.08.2026 stating that he had been working as a Head Cashier at Punjab National Bank, Gharsana Branch, for about 15 years. He alleged that he was wrongfully dismissed from the bank on the basis of a false allegation of embezzlement of ₹49,500, and that the CCTV footage was misrepresented against him.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 13.08.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Mahavir Godara	Complainant
2.	Shri Arun PR, Deputy General Manager	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Respondent, Punjab National Bank, appeared and submitted that the Complainant had been working as Head Cashier/Customer Service Associate at the Gharsana Branch and was proceeded against in connection with an alleged incident involving an amount of ₹49,500/-. It was submitted that CCTV footage relating to the incident was available and that, on the basis of the allegations and material available on record, a charge-sheet was issued against the Complainant. A departmental inquiry was thereafter initiated on 24.11.2025, wherein a preliminary hearing was conducted followed by eleven hearings, and the inquiry was concluded on 21.04.2026. Thereafter, the Disciplinary Authority issued a show-cause notice and afforded the Complainant an opportunity of personal hearing, following which an order imposing the penalty of removal from service was passed. The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant preferred an appeal before the Appellate Authority on 17.06.2026 and was also afforded an opportunity of personal hearing. The appeal was subsequently rejected on the ground that no new facts had been brought on record and the punishment imposed by the Disciplinary Authority was found to be valid.

3.2 The Court observed that the grievance, insofar as it challenges the findings of the departmental inquiry, appreciation of evidence, alleged misrepresentation of CCTV footage and the consequential disciplinary penalty, essentially pertains to a service/disciplinary matter. The Court further observed that where a departmental inquiry has been conducted in accordance with the applicable procedure, the allegations have been examined on the basis of evidence and the decision of the Disciplinary Authority has subsequently been considered and upheld by the Appellate Authority, this Court would not ordinarily interfere with the merits of such disciplinary proceedings in the absence of a specific issue falling within its jurisdiction under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. The Court also observed that any technical challenge concerning the authenticity, interpretation or alleged manipulation of CCTV footage may appropriately be raised before the competent departmental/vigilance authority or other forum having mandate over such matters.

3.3 The Court further observed that, to the extent the Complainant alleges that the disciplinary action was taken on account of his disability, the relevant records would be required to be examined to ascertain whether any discrimination, denial of reasonable accommodation or other violation of the rights guaranteed under the RPwD Act, 2016 is made out. The Court accordingly recommended the Respondent to furnish a complete copy of the departmental inquiry report, the relevant evidence/material relied upon during the inquiry, the orders passed by the Disciplinary Authority and Appellate Authority, and the relevant records

substantiating the decision taken against the Complainant.

3.4 The Respondent was accordingly recommended to submit the aforesaid records along with a detailed written representation explaining and justifying the action taken against the Complainant, particularly with reference to the allegations of disability-based discrimination, within **30 days** from the date of this order. The Court further observed that, insofar as the Complainant seeks relief against the disciplinary findings or punishment on grounds falling exclusively within the domain of service law, he may avail himself of such other remedy/forum as may be available to him in accordance with law. The Complainant shall remain at liberty to approach the Court afresh in case his grievance pertains to the statutory violations of the RPwD Act, 2016. Consequently, no further intervention is considered necessary in the matter at this stage.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities