



सत्यमेव जयते
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/14139/1022/23

In the matter of

Complainant

Mr. Montek Singh Chawla

Versus

Respondent (s)

The Comptroller and Auditor General of India, Deen Dayal Upadhyaya Marg

1. Gist of Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Mr. Montek Singh Chawla, a person with Benchmark Disability, currently posted as an Auditor in the branch PAG Department, Chandigarh, Haryana, filed a grievance dated 18.05.2023, contesting his current stationing and requesting a relocation. He submits that while he has made significant efforts to integrate into the new city and assume his professional duties, he is unable to cope with the daily requirements of independent living. He highlights extreme personal hardship, specifically noting that his condition requires the assistance of an escort for daily chores, a resource currently unavailable to him in Chandigarh. Furthermore, he identifies the daily commute from his lodgings to the office as a significant physical barrier that is very cumbersome given his specific disability. Citing the need for a supportive environment to maintain his well-

being and professional output, he seeks an immediate transfer/posting back to the Delhi office to ensure he has access to necessary personal assistance and can continue to perform his duties effectively.

2. Issue of Notice

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Respondent vide notice dated 28.06.2023 stating the provision u/s 3, 21, 23, 75, and section 20 (3) of the RPWD Act, 2016 and Rule 8(3) of RPWD Rule 2017 read with DOP&T OM No. 36035/44, 2023 Estt. (Res.-II) dated 02.02.2024.

2.2 Since no response was received, therefore, vide reminder notice dated 18.01.2024 was issued to furnish comments in light of the constitutional and statutory safeguards available to persons with disabilities. The notice specifically referred to Article 41 of the Constitution of India and the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, including Sections 4, 16, 20(2), 20(5), 21, 24, 27 and 38, emphasizing the obligations of the establishment to ensure non-discrimination, reasonable accommodation, equal opportunity, and protection of the rights of employees with disabilities. The Respondent's attention was also drawn to Rule 8(3) of the RPwD Rules, 2017, the DoPT Office Memoranda dated 31.03.2014, 06.06.2014 and 08.10.2018, and the Ministry of Finance Office Memorandum dated 15.02.1988, which prescribe the implementation of reservation, Equal Opportunity Policy, appointment of Liaison Officers, review of Recruitment Rules, and other safeguards for persons with disabilities. The Respondent was accordingly directed to submit a detailed report on the steps taken to ensure compliance with the aforesaid provisions.

3. Hearing

3.1 Following no response from either of the parties, a Notice of hearing was issued to both concerned parties dated 20.03.2026. However, proceedings could not be conducted as the Complainant's informed vide email dated 08.04.2026 that his grievance had been resolved by the O/o the Pr. Accountant General (Audit),

Haryana vide an Office Order dated 21.07.2023. The Complainant confirmed that he was transferred and relieved from Principal Accountant General (Audit) Branch, Chandigarh to New Delhi branch office on 06.12.2024. He successfully joined the CAG office, New Delhi w.e.f. 09.12.2024.

4. Observation and Recommendation

4.1 Upon reviewing the facts of the case and the documentary evidence, especially Complainant's email dated 08.04.2026; the complaint has been redressed by the Respondent department. Therefore, this Court determines that no further intervention is required.

5. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
Ipsita Mitra
Date: 17-09-2026
12:17:44

(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner