



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-0004/2026

In the Matter of

Shri Jitender Kumar Dua

...Complainant

Versus

The Managing Director, MetLife Global Operations Support Centre Private Ltd.

...Respondent

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 04.05.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Jitender Kumar Dua	Complainant
2.	Smt. Meeta Dua	Complainant
3.	Adv. Saurabh Leekha	Respondent
4.	Ms. Katyayani Dixit -Director HR	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Jitender Kumar Dua, a 100% hearing-impaired Senior Associate, filed a complaint dated 01.06.2026 against MetLife Global Operations. He submitted that after eight years of service at a monthly salary of ₹37,459, and following training for an anticipated promotion, his role was declared

redundant on 09.02.2026. He alleged he was subsequently offboarded to an external vendor (TGH Lifestyle Services) for a mailroom executive role at a severely reduced monthly CTC of ₹16,473. The Complainant contended that this arbitrary salary reduction and down-leveling caused severe financial and emotional distress to his household, where his wife is also a person with disability, and constitutes targeted employment discrimination in direct violation of Sections 3, 20, and 34 of the RPwD Act, 2016.

2.2 The Respondent, represented by legal counsel, maintained that the present complaint is procedurally unmaintainable as the Complainant is no longer a legal employee of the organization. Supported by internal restructuring data, the Respondent submitted that the Complainant was placed in a corporate redundancy pool on 11.02.2026 due to an organizational scaling and "ramp down" of his specific process, affecting 60 to 70 other employees across the board. The Respondent argued that the Complainant was single out on no ground, and because his corporate skill set failed to align with alternative process profiles during a mandatory 90-day redeployment window, the school, on purely humanitarian grounds, facilitated his placement with a third-party contractor. The Respondent contended that the Complainant consciously sat for an interview, accepted the alternative appointment letter, voluntarily resigned via the company portal on 08.05.2026, completed his notice period on 12.05.2026, and was duly disbursed a Full and Final (F&F) structural settlement package of approximately ₹3,37,000 in May 2026.

2.3 The Court observed that while organizational process restructurings, standard redundancy pools, and full-and-final settlement disbursements seem facially uniform, the critical issue to analyse is whether the resignation was a truly voluntary act or executed under administrative duress and coercive pressure. The Court noted that from a strictly procedural and technical perspective, the execution of institutional records and alternative vendor adjustments appears standard. However, the Court emphasized that a person with low literacy or specialized communication challenges can easily be systematically pressured by superiors into signing off their corporate rights, thereby losing their legal standing to challenge systemic workplace discrimination.

2.4 The Court emphasized that its fundamental purpose is to thoroughly examine behind formal paper trials to ensure corporate actions do not mask bad faith discrimination against employees with disabilities. The Court observed that while the Complainant should ideally have approached this forum before signing the corporate portal resignation, his claims of forceful execution by his reporting manager cannot be summarily dismissed at the threshold stage. Consequently, the

Court recommended that the Respondent must submit a detailed written report of their argument alongside all primary records, including the redundancy framework guidelines, proof of matching criteria for the pool, resignation logs, benefit disbursement records, and verified proofs showing identical placement treatments across non-disabled staff within fifteen (15) days.

2.5 Furthermore, the Court explicitly observed that the Complainant remains entirely free to formally maintain and continue this case individually against the specific reporting manager who allegedly forced him to sign the resignation letter, should he choose to pursue that remedy.

2.6 Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner