



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-0100/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Smt. Vidya Anmol Ghadge (W/o Balkrishna)

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Director General, CRPF

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Smt. Vidya Anmol Ghadge, wife of Shri Balkrishna who is a CRPF personnel, submitted a grievance dated 03.07.2026 stating that her 16-year-old daughter is a Person with 75% intellectual disability and requires constant care and medical support. She stated that they also have two other minor daughters and, due to her husband's posting far from home, she is solely responsible for caring for all three children. She further submitted that her husband has served in difficult postings throughout his career, including six years in Udhampur and eleven consecutive years (2015–2025) in the Naxal-affected area of Gadchiroli. She alleged that the CRPF wrongly treated his Gadchiroli posting as a "home state posting" while rejecting his request for transfer under the applicable DoPT guidelines. She stated that her husband never sought the Gadchiroli posting and was deployed there due to operational requirements.

1.2 The Complainant further alleged that her husband has complied with the transfer order and joined duty at 187 Battalion, Udhampur (J&K). However, she alleged that his continued posting away from the family has caused severe hardship, as she has no family support to manage her daughter's medical emergencies and rehabilitation. She also stated that her husband is considering

premature retirement due to the stress, which would adversely affect the family's financial stability and their daughter's lifelong treatment. She requested that her husband's transfer to a CRPF establishment in or near Pune or Mumbai be approved on humanitarian grounds and in accordance with the DoPT Office Memoranda.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 04.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Smt. Vidya Anmol Ghadge	Complainant
2.	Shri Balkrishna	Complainant

2.2 No representatives on behalf of the Respondent were present during the proceedings.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant, Smt. Vidya Ghadge, appeared before the Court and submitted that the present grievance pertained to the transfer of her husband, an employee of the Central Reserve Police Force (CRPF). During the course of the hearing, it was clarified that the complaint had been instituted by the Complainant in her own capacity, relying upon her status as the primary caregiver of a child with disability, while the service grievance itself related to the transfer of her husband.

3.2 Upon examining the nature of the grievance, the Court observed that transfer-related disputes constitute service matters and must ordinarily be instituted by the concerned employee whose service rights are directly affected. The Court further observed that while caregiver-related protections under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, may be relevant in appropriate cases, such protections cannot be invoked by a person who is not the affected employee to challenge another employee's transfer. The Court clarified that if the concerned employee intended to seek relief on the basis of caregiver-related protections, the complaint ought to be filed by the employee himself, setting out the relevant facts and legal grounds.

3.3 In view of the above, the Court found that the present complaint is not

maintainable, both on account of the Complainant lacking the requisite locus to pursue the service grievance on behalf of her husband and because the same case is currently sub-judice before the Hon'ble Delhi High Court (W.P.(C) No. 4880/2026). the Complainant shall remain at liberty to approach this Court afresh in accordance with law. It is further clarified that any service-related grievance concerning the transfer of the concerned employee should be instituted by the affected employee himself, in the appropriate capacity and in accordance with the applicable procedure.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities