



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-0159/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Nanak Chand

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Director, Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Nanak Chand, is a 100% visually impaired student of B.A. (Programme), First Year, School of Open Learning (SOL), University of Delhi. He submitted a grievance dated 10.08.2026 stating that he applied for the Post Matric Scholarship for Students with Disabilities on the National Scholarship Portal (NSP) on 13.10.2025. The Complainant stated that an old income certificate was uploaded by mistake while applying. After being informed by the SOL office that the certificate had expired, he submitted his new valid income certificate dated 17.10.2025 and requested the concerned official to replace the old certificate. He alleged that the official assured him that the new certificate would be uploaded. His application was subsequently verified at both the Institute and State levels.

1.2 However, he alleged that his scholarship was later withheld without giving him any prior information or opportunity to correct the document. He further stated that the NSP helpline gave him different and contradictory information regarding the status of his income certificate and ultimately informed him that the correction period had expired and that he would have to apply again in the next renewal cycle. The complainant stated that his financial condition is very poor and that he is dependent on the scholarship for continuing his education. He further submitted

that he is 100% visually impaired, his mother has a disability in one hand, and his elderly father is suffering from seizures and is unable to work. He has requested an urgent inquiry, correction and verification of his new income certificate on the NSP portal, and release of his pending scholarship at the earliest.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 13.08.2026 wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Nanak Chand	Complainant
2.	Shri Sandeep Kumar, Under Secretary	Respondent
3.	Shri Anand, Section Officer	Respondent

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Complainant further submitted that he had contacted the NSP helpline on several occasions and received differing information regarding the status of his income certificate and scholarship application. He was ultimately informed that the period for correction had expired and that he would have to apply in the subsequent renewal cycle. It was submitted that the Complainant is financially dependent upon the scholarship for continuation of his education and is facing significant financial hardship. He further stated that he is a person with 100% visual impairment, that his mother has a disability affecting one hand and that his elderly father, who is suffering from seizures, is unable to work. In view of these circumstances, the Complainant sought urgent intervention for verification/correction of his income certificate on the NSP and release of the scholarship amount.

3.2 On behalf of the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD), the Respondent submitted that the scholarship application had been verified on 15.01.2026 on the basis of the parameters prescribed in the NSP system. It was further submitted that, thereafter, the NIC system automatically forwarded the application to the concerned State Nodal Officer (SNO) for revalidation. The SNO was required to revalidate the application within the prescribed timeframe and before the last date. However, the application had not been revalidated by the concerned SNO within the stipulated period and,

consequently, the application could not be processed further at the Department level. The Respondent clarified that the application continued to remain pending for revalidation at the State Nodal Officer level and that the Department had not rejected the application at its end.

3.3 Upon consideration of the submissions, the Court observed that, as per the Respondent's submission, the Complainant's application had been duly verified at the Departmental level and had thereafter been automatically transmitted through the NSP system to the concerned State Nodal Officer for revalidation. Since the application had not been revalidated by the SNO within the prescribed period, the matter remained pending at the State level and could not proceed further at the Department level. The Court accordingly observed that, on the basis of the material placed before it, the Department could not at this stage be held responsible for rejection or non-processing of the scholarship application, as the application had not been rejected by the Department but remained pending for revalidation with the concerned State authority.

3.4 The Court, however, took note of the fact that the scholarship application had remained pending for a considerable period and that the prescribed timeline for processing the application had already elapsed. The Court observed that the Complainant had approached the Court only after a substantial period had passed and that, by the time of the present proceedings, approximately six months had elapsed from the relevant stage of processing. The Court further observed that, in view of the passage of time, it may not be practically possible for the Department to provide the scholarship benefit within the original processing cycle unless the application is appropriately examined by the authority responsible for its pending revalidation.

3.5 The Court further observed that the precise reason for non-revalidation of the application could not be conclusively determined from the submissions presently available. It remained to be ascertained whether the delay/non-processing occurred at the level of the State Nodal Officer, the concerned educational institution, or any other authority responsible for verification/revalidation of the application. The Court accordingly emphasized the need for the concerned authorities to meticulously examine the application and identify the stage at which the application remained pending and the reason for such non-revalidation.

3.6 In view of the above, the Court advised the Complainant to pursue the grievance before the concerned State Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities, particularly if, upon examination of the matter, any lapse or omission is found on

the part of the State Nodal Officer, the educational institution or any other State-level authority responsible for verification/revalidation of the scholarship application. The Court observed that the State Commissioner would be in a better position to examine the role of the concerned State authorities and provide appropriate redressal in accordance with the applicable scholarship guidelines and law.

3.5 The Court further observed that, considering the Complainant's 100% visual impairment, financial hardship and dependence upon the scholarship for continuation of his education, the concerned authorities should examine the matter with due sensitivity and ensure that any procedural or technical issue is appropriately addressed in accordance with the applicable rules and scholarship framework. The Court clarified that the present proceedings were being closed at this stage primarily because the application remained pending at the State-level revalidation stage and the material before the Court did not establish any rejection or lapse attributable to the Respondent Department.

3.6 Accordingly, the Complainant was advised to approach the State Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities with a copy of the scholarship application, valid income certificate dated 17.10.2025, relevant NSP records/status, verification details and other supporting documents, so that the competent State authority may ascertain the cause of non-revalidation and take appropriate action, if any lapse is found. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities