

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-0037/2026

In the matter of—

Mr. Yash Anil Jambhe
(Complainant)

Versus

Chairman
 Indian Oil Corporation Ltd., Mumbai
 Email: chairman@indianoil.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. Yash Anil Jambhe	Complainant	Online
2.	Dr. Prasant Rout, CGM (HR), Gujarat Refinery, IOCL	For Respondent	Online
3.	Shri Apurva Nagmote, GM (HR) & Ms. Sanjana, DGM (HR), Gujarat Refinery, IOCL	For Respondent	Online
4.	ED HR, Preeti Chopra, CGM (HR), Shri Pradeep Mishra, DGM (HR), RHQ Team	For Respondent	Online

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

The Complainant a person with 75% visual impairment, alleged that despite qualifying the Computer Based Test (CBT) and completing the document

verification process for recruitment against backlog vacancies reserved for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (PwBDs) in Indian Oil Corporation Limited (Refineries Division) he was not called for the subsequent medical examination. He alleged that his exclusion was arbitrary and lacked transparency and had caused him mental distress.

2. The representatives of IOCL submitted that recruitment process had been undertaken for non-executive posts, including the post of Junior Quality Control Analyst. It was submitted that four vacancies were notified for the post, including vacancies reserved for PwBD candidates, and that the recruitment process consisted of two stages, namely:

- i. Computer Based Test (CBT); and
- ii. Skill Proficiency and Physical Test (SPPT), which was qualifying in nature.

3. The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant had applied under the PwBD category and, on the basis of his performance in the CBT, was called for the SPPT. It was further submitted that the SPPT was conducted by a duly constituted team and that the Complainant appeared in the test on 18.05.2026. The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant **was not found fit/qualified** in the SPPT and, consequently, was not shortlisted for the pre-employment medical examination. It was stated that the decision was based on the prescribed eligibility criteria and recruitment procedure notified in the advertisement and recruitment rules. The Respondent explained that the SPPT involved assessment of job-related knowledge and skill. It was submitted that five questions were selected through the prescribed process and that the Complainant could not answer any of the five questions as per the evaluation sheet.

4. During the hearing, the Court sought clarification regarding the status of the backlog vacancies reserved for PwBD candidates, particularly whether the said vacancies had been filled and, if not, the reasons for their remaining vacant. The Respondent submitted that three candidates had been invited for the SPPT; two candidates did not appear, while the Complainant appeared but could not qualify the SPPT. The Court directed the Respondent to furnish a written reply along with supporting documents, explaining:

- i. the complete process followed for conducting and evaluating the SPPT;
- ii. the basis on which the Complainant was declared disqualified;
- iii. the evaluation record supporting the said decision; and
- iv. the reasons why the backlog vacancies earmarked for PwBD candidates remained unfilled.

5. The Respondent is directed to submit the requisite written response along with all supporting documents **within 15 days** from the issuance of this Order. Upon receipt and examination of the response, the Court shall decide whether any further hearing is required. In the absence of any further requirement, appropriate orders shall be issued. Therefore, the matter is adjourned.

(Vikas Trivedi)
Deputy Chief Commissioner