



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: 14409/1022/2023

In the matter of—

Complainant

Shri Raveendra Nath Maurya

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The General Manager, Food Corporation of India, Delhi
2. The Executive Director (North), Food Corporation of India, Noida (UP)

1. Gist of Complaint:

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Raveendra Nath Maurya submitted a grievance seeking transfer from Headquarters, New Delhi to UP Region on the ground that he is caregiver of his dependent daughter Ms. Aashi Maurya, a child with 90% permanent disability (Cerebral Palsy). The Complainant submitted that after his transfer from UP Region to Headquarters, New Delhi upon promotion, he faced serious hardship in providing proper care, rehabilitation and support to his daughter and aged dependent father. It was further submitted that he had applied through HRMS portal for posting near his hometown with preference for Azamgarh, Ayodhya and Gorakhpur in light of DoP&T O.M. dated 08.10.2018 and FCI transfer policy.

2. Notice Issued:

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Respondent vide notice dated 21.08.2023 under Sections 75, 77, 3, 20(5), 21 and 23 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 read with Rule 8 of the RPwD Rules, 2017.

3. Respondent's Reply to the Notice:

3.1 The Respondents, vide reply dated 20.09.2023, submitted that the Complainant's relocation from the UP Region to Headquarters, New Delhi, was executed pursuant to his promotion to the post of Manager (Accounts) in accordance with the prevailing transfer policy, further contending that the exemptions provided under the DoP&T Office Memorandum dated October 8, 2018, are applicable only to routine or rotational transfers and do not encompass transfers necessitated by promotion. Furthermore, the Respondents stated that the Complainant's subsequent transfer request has been duly rostered and shall be considered in due course, subject to the governing rules and administrative exigencies of the establishment.

4. Rejoinder:

4.1 In the rejoinder, the Complainant reiterated that as the primary caregiver for a child with a benchmark disability, his request warranted priority and sympathetic consideration under the extant Government guidelines, emphasizing that his current posting at New Delhi imposes persistent hardship on his familial responsibilities and the effective management of the child's disability-related needs.

5. Hearing and subsequent communications:

5.1 The Court observed that the present matter was listed for hearing pursuant to the Notice issued on 08.12.2025; however, prior to the scheduled proceedings, the Complainant, vide communication dated 09.12.2025, formally apprised this Court that his underlying grievance has been effectively redressed through his transfer from Delhi to Azamgarh, U.P. The complainant, accordingly, sought the withdrawal of his complaint.

6. Observation and Recommendation

6.1 The Court notes that the grievance pertained to the transfer hardship faced by an employee serving as the primary caregiver for a child with a benchmark disability. However, the Court emphasises that needs of an employee with disabilities or an employee who is a caregiver differ from case to case. Hence, there is a need for reasonable accommodation which will also be different from case-to-case basis. Thus, the Respondent should fulfil the mandates of 20 (5) of the RPwD Act, 2016, the Rule (8) (c) of the RPwD Rules, 2017, and the DoPT O.M No. 36035/44/2023 Estt. (Res) dated 02.02.2024 not only in letter but also in spirit.

6.2 Upon reviewing the facts of the case and the provided intimation, especially

complainant's email dated 09.12.2025, it is evident that the Complainant's request for relocation to his native place (Azamgarh U.P.) has been fully addressed by the Respondent department. Further, this Court determines that no further intervention is required.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

**Digitally signed by
Ipsita Mitra
Date: 17-09-2026
13:01:55**

(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities