

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-0044/2026

In the matter of—

Sh. Rajneesh Kenneth
(Complainant)

Versus

The Secretary,
Ministry of Railway (Railway Board)
Rail Bhawan, New Delhi
(Respondent)

Hearing:

A preliminary hearing was conducted on 19.06.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Sh. Rajneesh Kenneth	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Adesh Kumar, Director, Railway Board	For Respondent	Online
3.	Shri Krishankant, ACM, Lucknow	For Respondent	Online

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The complainant submitted that he had applied three times through the Indian Railways portal for issuance of a disability concession card, but his applications were rejected on each occasion on the ground that the signature on the uploaded documents was not clear. He further submitted that he had uploaded all the requisite documents correctly and that the documents had been issued by the concerned UDID authorities. He stated that, due to non-issuance of the disability concession card, he has been unable to avail the applicable railway fare

concession and has consequently been required to pay the full train fare.

2. The respondent submitted that the documents submitted by the complainant had been sent to the concerned hospital for verification. It was stated that the hospital stamp/signature on the certificate was not clear and the hospital had accordingly not accepted the document on that ground.

3. The Court observed that the purpose of sending the certificate to the concerned hospital for verification is to ascertain whether the certificate was genuinely issued by the hospital. The Court further observed that if the certificate has been issued by the concerned hospital and the signature or stamp appearing thereon is not clear, the same cannot, by itself, be treated as a valid ground for rejecting the certificate. The concerned hospital is required to clarify and confirm the authenticity of the certificate. It was further observed that a verbal statement from the hospital is not sufficient for the purpose of verification. A clear confirmation is required as to whether the certificate was genuinely issued by the concerned hospital. The Court noted that "not clear" cannot, by itself, be treated as a sufficient response from the hospital, particularly when the purpose of verification is to establish the genuineness and source of the certificate.

4. In view of the above, the respondent is directed to:

i. Obtain a clear and written verification from the concerned hospital confirming whether the certificate submitted by the complainant was genuinely issued by the said authority.

ii. In case the hospital finds the signature on the certificate unclear, the respondent shall obtain necessary clarification from the hospital authority and shall not reject the document merely on the ground that the signature is unclear.

iii. Submit the clear verification report of the concerned hospital before this Court within 15 days from the date of receipt of this Record of Proceedings.

5. No further hearing is warranted in the matter. Accordingly, the case is hereby closed.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities