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-0143/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Ms. Ritu Pathak

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Ms. Ritu Pathak, working as Finance Officer (Budget)/Senior Accounts Officer in the Ministry of Civil Aviation, submitted a grievance dated 06.08.2026 and stated that she had applied for reimbursement of the cost of an artificial prosthesis, an essential assistive device required for her mobility and day-to-day functioning. She alleged that despite the Office Memorandum dated 16.02.2026 issued by the Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, which dispenses with the requirement of prior concurrence of the Integrated Finance Division (IFD) for medical reimbursement claims up to ₹10 lakh, the Ministry of Civil Aviation unnecessarily referred her reimbursement proposal to the IFD, resulting in undue delay and hardship. The complainant further alleged that the Ministry has failed to implement the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities Office Memorandum dated 22.09.2025 relating to the reimbursement of artificial appliances for Government employees with disabilities. She contended that the Ministry has imposed unwarranted procedural requirements by seeking commercial quotations from the Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya National Institute for Persons with Physical Disabilities (PDDUNIPPD), although the Institute's role under the policy is limited to the medical assessment and prescription of the appropriate prosthesis and does not include providing or obtaining commercial quotations.

1.2 The complainant submitted that these actions are contrary to the Government's policy on the reimbursement of assistive devices and the objectives of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and have caused unnecessary delay in the reimbursement of an essential prosthesis. The complainant has requested the Chief Commissioner to direct the Ministry of Civil Aviation to process and settle her reimbursement claim without insisting on IFD concurrence or commercial quotations from PDDUNIPPD, to implement the applicable Government instructions in letter and spirit, and to issue appropriate directions clarifying the role of PDDUNIPPD under the reimbursement policy to prevent similar hardship to persons with disabilities in future.

2. Notice of Hearing

2.1 A Notice dated 07.08.2026 under sections 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (RPwD Act, 2016) was issued to the above-mentioned respondent for a hearing on 12.08.2026 in Hybrid mode to determine the admissibility of the case and find out if this can be resolved without a quasi-judicial intervention of this Court.

3. Respondent's Submission

3.1 The Respondent submitted vide letter dated 11.08.2026 that the Complainant had sought reimbursement of ₹9,75,000/- towards the cost of a Left Trans-Tibial Modular Hi-Tech Prosthesis, as her existing prosthesis had become non-functional and was causing significant mobility difficulties. It was submitted that the claim was processed in accordance with the applicable instructions and that the initial proforma invoice submitted by the Complainant was examined, following which technical confirmation regarding the prescribed prosthesis and vendor was sought from the Pt. Deendayal Upadhyaya National Institute for Persons with Physical Disabilities (PDDUNIPPD).

3.2 The Respondent further submitted that the prescribed prosthesis was recommended by the Head of the Prosthetics & Orthotics Department, PDDUNIPPD, on 15.06.2026, pursuant to which the Complainant submitted a fresh proforma invoice on 16.06.2026. It was stated that the Ministry thereafter undertook necessary follow-up with the Institute regarding the authorised vendor/supplier and that the proposal was subsequently examined by the Integrated Finance Division (IFD), which raised certain observations relating to financial admissibility, certification, vendor selection, reasonableness of price and receipt of financial assistance from other sources.

3.3 It was submitted that the Complainant furnished point-wise replies to the observations raised by IFD on 23.07.2026, and the proposal was cleared by IFD on 28.07.2026. The Respondent denied any deliberate or intentional delay in processing the claim and submitted that the time taken was attributable to the procedural, technical and financial scrutiny required for processing the reimbursement proposal.

3.4 The Respondent further submitted that, considering the mobility difficulties of the Complainant, her case was processed on a reimbursement basis as a special accommodation. The Competent Authority, i.e. the Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation, thereafter approved reimbursement of an amount up to ₹9,75,000/- in consultation with IFD. An Office Memorandum dated 10.08.2026 was subsequently issued directing the Complainant to submit the original bills/invoices for release of the payment.

3.5 In view of the approval accorded to the reimbursement claim and the consequential action taken for release of the admissible amount, the Respondent submitted that the grievance of the Complainant stood resolved and requested that the matter be closed.

4. Hearing

4.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 12.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Ms. Ritu Pathak	Complainant
2.	Shri Vijayant Kumar Arora, DS	Respondent

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 The Complainant, Smt. Ritu Pathak, Finance Officer, Ministry of Civil Aviation, appeared before the Court and confirmed that her grievance had been redressed. She submitted that the requisite approval had been accorded and the Office Memorandum had also been issued. She stated that her grievance primarily concerned the delay in processing her case and the clarifications sought by the Integrated Finance Division (IFD). The Court took note of the submissions and observed that persons with disabilities should be treated with dignity and respect and that all legally mandated entitlements should be extended without avoidable delay.

5.2 The Court further observed that delay in extending an otherwise admissible entitlement to a person with disability may itself amount to harassment and advised the Respondent to ensure that such avoidable delays do not recur in future. In view of the confirmation of the Complainant that her grievance had been redressed and the assurance of the Respondent in this regard, the matter was treated as resolved.

6. Observation and Recommendations

6.1 Upon reviewing the facts of the case and the available records, it is clear that the Complainant's grievance has been addressed.

6.2 After considering the submissions from both parties, especially the Complainant's submissions during the proceedings; consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 27-08-2026
12:23:12

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities