

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-0032/2026

In the matter of—

Mr. Vijay Pal Singh Adhikari
 Email: vpsadhikari@gmail.com
(Complainant)

Versus

Director,
 National Institute for the Empowerment of
 Persons with Visual Disabilities (Divyangjan)
 Email: director-niepvd@nivh.gov.in
(Respondent)

Hearing:

A preliminary hearing in hybrid mode (online/offline) was conducted on 15.06.2026. The following parties/representatives were present during the hearing:

Sl.No.	Name of the parties/Representatives	For Complainant/ Respondent	Mode of Attendance
1.	Mr. Vijay Pal Singh Adhikari	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Pradeep A, Director, NIEPVD, Dehradun	For Respondent	Online
3.	Shri Amit Kumar Sharma, Principal, Model School, NIEPVD and In-charge, Early Intervention Centre, NIEPVD, Dehradun	For Respondent	Online

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. The matter was taken up as an admissibility hearing. The Complainant submitted that his son, Master Shivansh Adhikari, a child with 100% visual impairment, had been receiving services at the Early Intervention Centre, NIEPVD, for about two-and-a-half years. It was alleged that speech therapy services were unavailable for a prolonged period and that the discontinuation of such therapy had adversely affected the child's rehabilitation and education. It was further alleged that therapy was discontinued on the basis of "age" without a comprehensive expert assessment or an appropriate rehabilitation plan and that the child's admission to the school was subsequently not considered on account of his additional developmental and speech-related difficulties.
2. The Respondent submitted that the child had availed approximately 930 therapy sessions over about two-and-a-half years and that, as per the norms, therapy services were primarily provided to children in the age group of 0–6 years. Regarding speech therapy, the Respondent stated that efforts were made to engage another Speech Therapist. The Respondent further stated that therapy had been continued to the extent possible.
3. On the issue of admission, the Respondent stated that the Model School caters to children with visual impairment and that concerns had arisen regarding the child's developmental delay, speech & communication difficulties.
4. The Court observed that the presence of additional disabilities, developmental delay or associated difficulties cannot by itself be a ground to avoid or deny admission to a child with visual impairment. It was observed that the institution is required to adopt an inclusive and enabling approach and make efforts to accommodate children with multiple disabilities and provide the necessary support and related services. The Court further observed that the child had already been associated with the Institute for about two-and-a-half years and was not a stranger to the institution; therefore, the Institute should not find reasons to avoid his admission but should guide the parents and facilitate his admission.
5. The Court also expressed concern over the approach of the Principal and observed that the Institute should make efforts to accommodate the child instead of advising the parents to seek an alternative. The Director, NIEPVD, assured the Court that the matter would be considered and that the Principal would be appropriately guided. The Court further directed that the child should be considered positively and that no reason should be created to avoid or reject his admission.
6. In view of the submissions and the assurance given by the Respondent, the Court decides not to register the matter as a Case. However, the Director, NIEPVD, is advised to ensure that the Principal makes sincere efforts to

accommodate the child and provide the necessary support. In case the parents face any difficulty in this regard, they would be at liberty to approach the Court again.

6. Accordingly, the case is disposed of

(Vikas Trivedi)
Deputy Chief Commissioner