



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.ccpd.nic.in

Case No. 14564/1092/2023

In the matter of —

Shri Santosh Annamalai

...Complainant

Versus

The Secretary,
Railway Board

...Respondent

1. Gist of the Case:

1.1 Shri Santosh Annamalai, a person with 50% locomotor disability, filed a complaint dated 25.07.2023 regarding denial of issuance of a Railway Concession ID Card on the ground that he had not submitted a Railway Concession Certificate issued by a Government Doctor.

1.2 The Complainant submitted that he had already furnished his UDID Disability Certificate (DigiLocker certified) and Form-VII issued by the State Medical Board, but the same were not accepted by the Railway authorities. He contended that requiring a separate Railway Concession Certificate despite possession of a disability certificate issued by a competent authority results in duplication of the certification process and causes avoidable hardship to persons with disabilities.

1.3 The Complainant further submitted that the requirement of undergoing another medical verification was inconsistent with the objective of the UDID system and invoked the principles of equality, dignity and non-discrimination under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016. He also referred to the practices followed by certain State Transport Corporations wherein UDID is accepted for extending concessions to persons with disabilities.

1.4 The Complainant sought, inter alia, acceptance of the UDID Disability Certificate in place of the Railway Concession Certificate and reconsideration of his

rejected application No. 521832 on the basis of the documents already submitted.

2. Notice issued to the Respondent:

2.1 A Notice dated 18.10.2023 was issued to the Secretary, Railway Board, directing the Respondent to furnish its comments on the complaint with reference to the relevant provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and the Rules framed thereunder.

3. Reply filed by the Respondent:

3.1 The Respondent submitted its reply dated 09.11.2023, stating that the complaint had been examined and that a similar issue relating to concession in passenger fare/UDID card for persons with disabilities, in Case No. 13917/1031/2023 (Shri Suhas Karnik), was already under examination.

4. Hearing:

4.1 A hearing in hybrid mode was conducted on 12.11.2025, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S. No.	Name and Designation	Parties	Mode of Attendance
1.	Shri Santosh	Complainant	Online
2.	Shri Rohit Kumar, Joint Director, Railway Board	Respondent	Online

5. Record of Proceedings:

5.1 The Complainant submitted that requiring a separate Railway Concession Certificate was unnecessary and burdensome as he already possessed a valid UDID certificate issued by the competent authority. He stated that persons with disabilities were required to undergo repeated medical verification and visit doctors despite already possessing a UDID card, thereby defeating the objective of having a unified disability identification system.

5.2 The Respondent submitted that, as per the prevailing Railway policy, the UDID card was accepted for specified purposes/categories and that, for other eligible categories, the existing procedure for issuance of the Railway Divyangjan ID/concession certificate continued to apply. It was also stated that concession tickets could not presently be booked directly on the basis of the UDID card in all cases.

5.3 The Complainant reiterated that, even where a separate Railway Divyangjan ID is considered necessary for operational purposes, persons who already possess a valid disability certificate should, as far as possible, not be subjected to repeated medical examination and certification.

5.4 The Court has taken note of Railway Board Commercial Circular No. 01 of 2025 dated 22.01.2025, which, inter alia, provides for use of the UDID card/certificate issued in accordance with the instructions of the Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment in lieu of the Railway Proforma certificate for issuance of the Railway Divyangjan ID in cases covered by the revised provisions relating to blindness, subject to the conditions prescribed therein. The said Circular does not, however, extend such dispensation uniformly to all categories of disability.

5.5 The Court further notes that Section 58(3) of the RPwD Act, 2016 provides that a certificate of disability issued under the said section shall be valid across the country. Further, Rule 19 of the RPwD Rules, 2017 provides that a person to whom a certificate issued under Rule 18 is issued shall be entitled to apply for facilities, concessions and benefits admissible to persons with disabilities under Government schemes and schemes of Government-funded non-Governmental Organisations.

5.6 At the same time, the Court observes that the validity of a disability certificate and the eligibility for a particular concession are two distinct aspects. While a valid disability certificate establishes the certified disability, the grant of a particular Railway concession remains subject to the eligibility conditions and policy applicable to that concession.

6. Observations and Recommendations:

6.1 The Court observes that the grievance raised by the Complainant essentially relates to the duplication of the certification process and the difficulties faced by persons with disabilities in obtaining a separate Railway certification despite possessing a valid disability certificate issued by a competent authority.

6.2 The Court is of the view that, wherever the existing Railway rules and eligibility conditions permit, the Railway Board may consider greater reliance on the UDID system for verification of disability, so as to minimise avoidable duplication of medical certification and reduce the need for repeated physical visits to medical authorities.

6.3 The Railway Board may also consider examining the feasibility of progressively integrating UDID verification with the Railway Divyangjan ID/booking system,

subject to the applicable eligibility conditions, technical feasibility and operational requirements.

6.4 The Court further recommends that the Railway Board may consider issuing clear and consolidated instructions to the Zonal Railways regarding the documents acceptable for verification of disability and the circumstances in which a separate Railway certification is required, so as to minimise ambiguity and ensure uniform implementation.

6.5 These recommendations are intended to facilitate ease of access and reduction of avoidable procedural hardship for persons with disabilities and shall not be construed as altering the eligibility criteria prescribed by the Railway Board for any particular concession.

6.6 The Respondent is advised to examine the recommendations and take such appropriate action as may be considered feasible under the prevailing Railway policy and applicable rules.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 09-09-2026
17:34:28

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities