



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.ccd disabilities.nic.in

Case No: 14197/1023/2023

In the Matter of

Shri Medapati S Narayana

...Complainant

Versus

The Principal Accountant General (A&E), Meghalaya

...Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Sh. Medapanti S Narayana Reddy, an ex-serviceman currently serving as a DEO-A in the Office of the Principal Accountant General (A&E), Meghalaya, submitted a formal complaint on 30-04-2023 seeking the refund and restoration of 22 days of Earned Leave and 5 days of Half Pay Leave that were forcibly debited from his leave account. He submits that due to his 45% locomotor disability and the unprecedented COVID-19 lockdown in 2020, he was physically unable to rejoin duty because train services from his nearest station, Rajahmundry to Guwahati, were completely suspended. Although this transport disruption was later officially confirmed by the Railways, and despite the fact that he duly informed the office, undertook mandatory quarantine as per government orders, and submitted official clarifications from both the Railway and Airport Authorities, the department unfairly treated a portion of his absence as delayed joining. Instead of considering his physical disability and the extraordinary pandemic circumstances, the department compelled him to apply for leave to cover the period. Consequently, his repeated representations for the restoration of his leave were rejected without proper or lawful justification, prompting him to seek immediate intervention for the redressal of his grievance and the refund of the wrongly adjusted leave.

2. Notice Issued

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Principal Accountant General (A&E), Meghalaya vide letter dated 22.06.2023 citing statutory provisions and government instruction including but not limited to Section 20 of the Act and DoPT OM No. 11013/9/2014-Estt (A.III) dated 27.03.2020.

3. Respondent's Reply to the Notice

3.1 The Sr. Dy. Accountant General (Admn) and Grievance Officer submitted a reply vide email dated 24.07.2023 that the Complainant had proceeded on long leave from December 2019 to April 2020 and was required to rejoin duty on 10.04.2020 but failed to do so despite resumption of train and flight services from the last week of May 2020. They contended that other similarly placed employees stranded during the COVID-19 lockdown managed to report back to duty by June–July 2020 after quarantine whereas the Complainant delayed booking his travel and ultimately reported only on 03.08.2020. They further stated that out of the total absence period, 88 days were regularised as “worked from home” and only the remaining 27 days were directed to be covered by leave due to delayed joining. It was further argued that the Complainant could have used connecting trains or flights to reach Guwahati and that his failure to do so reflected a lackadaisical approach, unconnected with his disability. The Respondents also asserted that the CCS (Leave) Rules, 1972 do not permit re-crediting of leave once it has been regularised and therefore prayed for dismissal of the complaint.

4. Rejoinder

4.1 The Complainant submitted a rejoinder dated 28.07.2023 and explained that his absence during the COVID-19 period was unavoidable due to nationwide lockdowns, cancellation of trains and mandatory institutional and home quarantine imposed by the Government of Meghalaya. He details that he had duly informed his office in advance, sought extension of leave, obtained necessary permissions and made continuous efforts to rejoin duty, including booking flights and complying with all COVID protocols. Despite this, his office treated 27 days as unauthorized delay and deducted 22 days of Earned Leave and 5 days of Half Pay Leave, even though railway and airport authorities confirmed non-availability of train and flight services. He refutes allegations of lackadaisical attitude, highlights his diligence and attendance after rejoining and contends that as a person with disability, he ought to have been allowed work from home as per DoPT guidelines. He therefore seeks refund/restoration of the deducted leave and appropriate relief.

5. Further Submissions

5.1 The Respondent, vide email dated 04.09.2025, submitted that the

Complainant's request for re-credit of 27 days of regularized leave, comprising 22 days of Earned Leave and 5 days of Half Pay Leave, was not acceded to, as the CCS (Leave) Rules, 1972 do not provide for re-credit of such leave once regularized.

6. Hearing

6.1. A hearing was conducted on 07.01.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Medapati S Narayana Reddy	Complainant
2.	Mr. Saberius Nangbah, Senior Accounts	Respondent

7. Record of Proceedings

7.1 The Complainant, contended that under prevailing government advisories during lockdown, disabled and pregnant employees were to be prioritized for work-from-home accommodations. He alleged that his absence was due to severe transit disruptions and should have been adjusted as a special leave or continuous duty rather than a deduction from his leaves.

7.2 The Respondent maintained that after the central lockdown was lifted and transit networks resumed operations, the office issued an explicit directive dated 04.06.2020 ordering all staff members stranded in their hometowns to report back to active duty. The Respondent submitted that out of an entire absence pool spanning 115 days (from 10.04.2020 to 02.08.2020), the office had already proactively regularized 88 days (up to 06.07.2020) as work-from-home duty for the Complainant, matching the uniform relief provided to all other stranded staff. However, because the Complainant failed to report to duty by the generalized deadline of 06.07.2020 and instead reported only on 03.08.2020, the remaining 27 days of absence were procedurally treated as a standard leave deduction. The Respondent argued that other staff members stranded as far as Haryana and Tripura managed to navigate regional transport options to resume office work on schedule.

8. Observation

8.1 The Court observed that the grievance primarily pertains to regularization and

accounting of leave under the applicable service rules. It was also noted that the Respondent had extended work-from-home/leave regularization to the Complainant during the lockdown period in accordance with the arrangements applicable to employees generally.

8.2 The Court further observed that the Complainant had not placed sufficient material on record to establish that the delay in reporting for duty, after resumption of normal transit facilities, was attributable to any disability-related discrimination or denial of a statutory entitlement under the RPwD Act, 2016. The grievance, therefore, essentially concerns a service-related issue governed by the applicable leave rules, and no specific violation of the rights of a Person with Disability was established warranting intervention by this Court.

9. The case is accordingly disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 24-09-2026
10:23:13

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities