



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: 16489/1022/2026

In the Matter of

Shri Rahul Kumar Satyarathi

...Complainant

Versus

The Chief Managing Director, Bank of India, Varanasi

..Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Rahul Kumar Satyarathi, a Bank of India clerk with an 80% low-vision disability, who is seeking an inter-zone transfer from Varanasi to Dehradun on spouse disability and employment grounds. His wife, Sonia Pal, is 100% visually impaired, works as an Assistant at United India Insurance in Dehradun, and is suffering from severe medical complications following an incomplete abortion that requires his immediate physical and mental support. Despite strong local recommendations from his Senior Branch Manager dating back to December 2024, the bank's higher management failed to act, prompting the Complainant to appeal to the Court under Section 3(5) of the RPwD Act, 2016 for reasonable accommodation.

2. Notice Issued

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Respondent vide notice dated 24.04.2026 citing provisions u/s 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. Complainant's reply to the Notice

3.1 Following a first notice issued to the bank on 24.04.2026, subsequent emails from the complainant dated 07.05.2026, 12.05.2026, and 22.05.2026 were received. The Complainant appealed to correct the case subject matter from

“native place” to “spouse disability and job grounds.”

4. Hearing

4.1. A hearing was conducted on 04.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Rahul Kumar Satyarathi	Complainant
2.	Shri Manoj Kumar, DZM, Varanasi zone	Respondent
3.	Shri Ankush head office, chief manager, IR division	Respondent

5. Record of Proceedings

5.1 During the proceedings, The Respondent bank, represented by its Zonal General Manager and Chief Manager of Industrial Relations (IR), submitted that the establishment has taken a collaborative approach by granting an interim relief to the Complainant. The Respondent reported that a temporary 3-month transfer to Dehradun has been successfully approved to address the immediate domestic emergency. Regarding permanent inter-zone deployment, the Respondent clarified that the bank is currently undergoing an extensive, nation-wide manpower strengthening exercise to evaluate deficit and surplus zones. The corporate management maintained that a final structural map of vacancies will stabilize within a month or two, after which the Complainant's request for a permanent absorption against an active station vacancy in Dehradun will be evaluated on high priority.

5.2 The Complainant confirmed that he has been informed of the 3-month temporary transfer order and expressed his preliminary satisfaction with the immediate proximity to his office. However, he raised serious anxieties regarding the temporary nature of the relief, emphasizing that a brief 3-month relocation would not suffice to provide stable care for his spouse's long-term medical recovery, and sought definitive legal assurances regarding the permanent extension of his posting.

6. Observation and Recommendation

6.1 After reviewing the submissions of both the parties, the Court observed that while the bank's execution of a 3-month interim transfer provides immediate rescue, a temporary patch does not fulfil the spirit of the law when dealing with a

household where both spouses suffer from severe, interdependent visual benchmark disabilities. The Court emphasized that under the mandate of the RPwD Act, 2016, public sector employers must proactively provide reasonable accommodation, which strongly supports aligning workplace transfers with the choice of location of employees with benchmark disabilities to ensure independent living and family support structures.

6.2 However, the Court emphasises that such cases differ from case to case. However, the Respondent should take 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 into account. The Respondent needs to decide/review the matters in the light of the legal frameworks on the issue as mentioned above as part of reasonable accommodation of RPwD Act, 2016.

6.3 Consequently, the Court determined that a permanent solution must be formulated instead of rolling interim reliefs. The Respondent bank is hereby recommended to submit the formal transfer order and the corresponding joining report of the Complainant to this forum within seven (7) days. Furthermore, the bank is directed to evaluate the final deployment matrix with a view to accommodate the employee permanently at his preferred station. The Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

7. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 23-09-2026
09:58:23

S. Govindaraj

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities