



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-0007/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Sakil Khan

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Chief Executive Officer, UIDAI, New Delhi

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Sakil Khan, submitted a grievance dated 01.06.2026 stating that, on 18.03.2026, an operator at an India Post Aadhaar Centre had charged a sum of ₹125 for carrying out the mandatory biometric update of the Aadhaar card of a child with disability, despite such updates being required to be provided free of cost under the applicable UIDAI guidelines. The Complainant further alleged that the biometric update request was subsequently rejected, resulting in difficulties in availing various government and medical benefits linked to the Aadhaar card. The Complainant accordingly sought appropriate action against the concerned operator and redressal of the grievance.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 05.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Deepak, Assistant Manager (Legal)	Respondent
2.	Shri Pradeep Kumar, Section Officer	Respondent

3.	Shri Himanshu Dabra, Representative from Head Office	Respondent
----	--	------------

2.2 No representative appeared on behalf of the Complainant during the proceedings.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 The Respondents, represented by officials of the Regional Office, Delhi and the Unique Identification Authority of India (UIDAI), submitted that the matter had been examined and referred to the concerned technical and regional teams for a comprehensive inquiry. It was submitted that, although the investigation was still in progress, the father of the Aadhaar holder had already been contacted, and doorstep biometric enrolment had been facilitated at the child's place of residence. The Respondents further submitted that, although the prescribed charge for home enrolment was approximately ₹700, the biometric update had been carried out free of cost in the present case. It was further submitted that a detailed inquiry report identifying the cause of the rejection of the biometric update request, as well as the allegation regarding collection of ₹125, would be submitted before the Commission. The Respondents stated that, prima facie, the rejection appeared to have resulted from a technical issue, though the final position would emerge only upon completion of the investigation.

3.2 Upon hearing the Respondents, the Court observed that authorities responsible for Aadhaar enrolment and updating must remain vigilant to ensure that persons with disabilities are not subjected to unauthorised or impermissible charges for services which are required to be provided free of cost under the applicable guidelines. The Court observed that, where enrolment operators are found to have repeatedly violated the prescribed norms, appropriate disciplinary measures, including cancellation of their authorization, may be considered in accordance with law.

3.3 The Court appreciated the prompt action taken by the Respondents in facilitating free doorstep biometric enrolment for the child despite the usual charge applicable for such services. However, the Court observed that the provision of doorstep services for persons with disabilities who are unable to visit enrolment centers should not depend solely upon case-to-case discretion and advised the Respondents to evolve clear eligibility criteria and a uniform policy governing such services so as to minimize hardship and avoid unnecessary complaints.

3.4 In view of the above, the Court recommended the Respondents to submit, within fifteen (15) days, a comprehensive Action Taken Report together with a

Compliance Report specifically indicating the outcome of the inquiry into the allegations regarding the collection of ₹125, the reasons for rejection of the biometric update request, the action, if any, taken against the concerned enrolment operator, and the measures proposed to sensitize operators and prevent recurrence of similar incidents. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities