



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.ccpd.nic.in

Case No.: CCPD-OF-0044/1121/2026 (CCPD-AD-0019/2026)

In the matter of:

Shri Manish Kumar

...Complainant

Versus

The Director, AIIMS New Delhi

...Respondent

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Manish Kumar, submitted a grievance dated 02.06.2026 stating that he applied for a UDID card for hearing disability and that his application was submitted to AIIMS New Delhi on 8 January 2026. He stated that on 12 February 2026, the status of his application showed that specialists had been assigned for medical assessment. The complainant alleged that, even after more than four months, his medical assessment has not been completed and his UDID card has not been issued. He therefore requested that the authorities be directed to complete the assessment and issue his UDID card at the earliest.

2. Hearing

2.1 A preliminary hearing was conducted in Case No.CCPD-AD-0019/2026 on 18.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S.NO	NAME /DESIGNATION OF THE PARTY	REPRESENTATIVE OF
1	Shri Manish Kumar	Complainant
2	Dr. Nishant, Assistant Professor, Hospital Administration	Respondent
3	Shri Mao Bhartiya, Technical officer department of	Respondent

ENT AIIMS	
-----------	--

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Mr. Manish Kumar, submitted a grievance as Respondent No. 1, and the Medical Superintendent, AIIMS, New Delhi as Respondent No. 2. The Complainant submitted that he had applied for a Unique Disability ID (UDID) card and disability certificate in January 2026. He contended that despite undergoing the requisite medical and physical examinations by institutional specialists shortly after his application, the hospital administration subjected him to an extensive, unmitigated delay of several months, failing to generate or disburse his legal identity documentation within a reasonable timeline.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent medical institution, represented by Smt. Mao Bhartiya, submitted that the delay in processing the Complainant's application was fundamentally driven by a combination of technological and administrative constraints. The Respondent explained that the specialized web domain and backend architecture of the centralized UDID portal were undergoing an intensive system upgradation maintained by the line Ministry, which severely disrupted standard data entry and upload operations. Additionally, the institutional timelines were impacted by the legal summer vacations of the medical board. The Respondent confirmed, however, that the clinical assessment had been finalized and, following the receipt of this Court's hearing notice, the digital certificate and UDID records were successfully generated and uploaded to the portal on June 17, 2026, at 4:00 PM, making them immediately available for online download.

2.3 The Complainant raised a secondary concern during the hearing, questioning whether the generated certificate was provisioned on a temporary or permanent basis. The Court clarified that the initial grievance was strictly confined to the administrative delay in the dispersal of the UDID card. The Court observed that the clinical classification, duration, and medical parameters of a disability certificate are determined strictly by the expert medical board's physical assessment and cannot be legally challenged or altered within a proceeding focused purely on administrative delay. The Complainant was advised that if he remains aggrieved by the core medical findings of the assessment, he retains the explicit liberty to file a fresh, independent complaint addressing those specific technical issues.

2.4 The Court evaluated the matter and expressed serious concern over the

tendency of public health institutions to offer systemic software updates or minor communication limits as acceptable reasons for stalling public welfare benefits. The Court remarked that a disability certificate and a UDID card are essential gateways to legal rights, and every day an institution delays their issuance, a person with a disability is directly denied critical state-backed benefits and statutory protections. The Court emphasized that when vital web portals malfunction, field authorities must actively issue formal, written communications to the respective ministries to rectify the infrastructure immediately rather than relying on informal phone calls or digital chat groups.

2.5 Accordingly, since the primary grievance regarding the non-issuance of the UDID certificate stands resolved with its digital generation on 17.06.2026. The Respondent authorities were recommended to strictly adhere to statutory timelines in all future applications and handle the documentation of persons with disabilities with the highest level of sensitivity and administrative diligence. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

3. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities