



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-0129/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Kumar Rahul

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Managing Director & CEO, Bank of Baroda

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Kumar Rahul, an employee of Bank of Baroda, submitted a grievance dated 08.07.2026 stating that his three-year-old son has 100% hearing impairment and has undergone a cochlear implant, requiring continuous medical care, speech therapy, and family support. He stated that despite repeated representations and requests for transfer on compassionate grounds to Patna, where his relatives can assist in the child's care, the Bank has consistently rejected his transfer request and willingness application without considering the Government guidelines relating to caregivers of children with disabilities. He alleged that the denial of transfer has caused severe hardship and is adversely affecting his son's rehabilitation and development. He requested intervention to direct the Bank of Baroda to review his case on compassionate grounds and transfer him to Patna or a nearby location.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 07.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of

1.	Shri Dinesh Kumar, DGM-HR	Respondent
2.	Shri Abhishek, Chief Manger	Respondent

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

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 The Respondent submitted that the Complainant had earlier sought a transfer, which had been considered and granted by the Bank. It was further submitted that, subsequently, the Complainant's wife also sought transfer to Patna and her request had likewise been considered favorably. The Respondent informed the Court that the Complainant's wife had already been transferred to Patna and had joined her posting on 29.06.2026. It was further submitted that the Complainant is a specialized Foreign Exchange Officer, and owing to administrative and cadre-related constraints, his immediate transfer could not be accommodated. However, the Respondent assured the Court that the Complainant's request would be considered sympathetically as and when a suitable vacancy became available.

3.2 Upon hearing the submissions, the Court observed that the Respondent had already extended substantial consideration to the family's circumstances by transferring the Complainant's wife, who is capable of acting as the primary caregiver for the child with benchmark disability. The Court further observed that the objective underlying the DoPT Office Memorandum No. 42011/3/2014-Estt. (Res.) dated 08.10.2018, namely, facilitating the care and rehabilitation of dependents with disabilities by providing suitable posting to the caregiver, stood substantially addressed in the present case. The Court observed that the said Office Memorandum contemplates such postings "as far as possible" and is subject to administrative exigencies; it does not confer an absolute or recurring right upon multiple family members to seek transfers to the same station. In the present case, the Respondent has already accommodated the family's caregiving needs to a considerable extent, while indicating that the Complainant's transfer may also be considered in accordance with administrative convenience and availability of suitable vacancies.

3.3 The Court further observed that transfer is primarily an administrative matter and, in the absence of arbitrariness or discrimination, judicial intervention is ordinarily unwarranted. At the same time, the Court expected the Respondent to

continue adopting a humane and compassionate approach while considering the Complainant's request, keeping in view the special needs of his child and subject to administrative convenience.

3.4 The Court notes that the Respondent has assured this Court that they will consider his transfer as and when a vacancy arises within 3-4 months. In view of the same, the Court advised the Respondent to consider the Complainant's transfer request on humanitarian grounds, as and when a suitable opportunity arises, having due regard to the medical condition of the Complainant's child and the administrative requirements of the Bank. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities