



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: CCPD-AD-0064/2026

In the Matter of

Shri Lakshmi Kant Ramesh Chandra Patel

...Complainant

Versus

The State Bank of India (SBI)

...Respondent

1. Hearing

1.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 30.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Lakshmi Kant Ramesh Chandra Patel (Couldn't respond due to network issues)	Complainant
2.	Shri Deepak Chandra, DGM, SBI circle	Respondent
3.	AGM (HR) and Team, SBI HR Department	Respondent

2. Record of Proceedings

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Lakshmi Kant Ramesh Chandra Patel, a Manager Scale-III at the State Bank of India, Navrangpura branch, holding a 100% visual impairment disability, submitted a grievance alleging that despite joining the bank in 2009 under the visually impaired category and being eligible for promotion from MMGS-III to SMGS-IV, his promotion has been withheld. He contended that SBI failed to properly implement the provisions of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities

(RPwD) Act, 2016, and the reservation policy for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities (PwBD) in its promotion exercises for the financial years 2025–26 and 2026–27. He further alleged that despite possessing the required experience, his name was wrongfully excluded from the zone of consideration, and that the regional manager intentionally discriminated against him, leaving his prior representations submitted in May 2025 and May 2026 unacted upon.

2.2 During the proceedings, the Respondent submitted that the Complainant is a Scale-III officer who was indeed included in the zone of selection and given an opportunity to appear for the senior management grade scale (SMGS-IV) interview. The Respondent argued that after clubbing the interview marks with his performance appraisals, the Complainant failed to qualify on merit for the final selection list. Regarding the reservation policy, the Respondent stated that the bank strictly adheres to the DoPT policy guidelines and the Department of Financial Services Office Memorandum dated December 6, 2017, which equates Junior Management Grade Scale-I (JMGS-I) in public sector banks to Group 'A' posts in the Government of India. The Respondent contended that the reservation applies to the lowest rung of Group 'A' represents and the Complainant has already progressed beyond JMGS-I to Scale-III, the statutory reservation criteria do not apply to promotions from Scale-III to Scale-IV.

2.3 The Court observed that while the Complainant could not verbally present his arguments during the hearing due to ongoing technical and audio-visual connectivity issues, his written grievance raises specific claims regarding exclusion and non-implementation of promotion policies.

3. Complainant's Submission

3.1 The Complainant, Shri Laxmikant Rameshchandra Patel, a Scale III Auto Loan Hub Manager at SBI Navrangpura, Ahmedabad, submitted a written statement vide email dated 01.07.2026 after technical glitches prevented him from responding during his scheduled hearing. He alleges that Regional Manager, Mr. Ajay Jobanputra engaged in discriminatory and inhumane behavior by deliberately excluding his name from the Zone of Selection (ZOS) for promotions. The Complainant asserts that this exclusion directly violates his constitutional rights under Articles 15(1), 16(1), and 21, as well as the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (RPwD) Act 2016, which guarantees equal opportunity, reasonable accommodation, and protection against the denial of promotion based on disability.

3.2 To address these grievances, the Complainant requests a formal inquiry and a thorough comparative review of the qualifications, branch performances, and CDS/PAF scores of the eligible candidates. He further highlights systemic failures

by the bank, including the non-implementation of the mandated 4% PwD reservation for Scale IV and V promotions during the 2025-26 and 2026-27 cycles, the withholding of certified roster copies, and a lack of transparency regarding identified reserved posts. Additionally, he notes the absence of a proper grievance process for PwD candidates and cites non-compliance with the Ministry of Personnel's Office Memorandum dated 17.05.2022 and relevant judicial precedents (WP 6027/2025).

4. Observation and Recommendation

4.1 The Court noted the Respondent's argument that the reservation policy is not applicable within the higher grades of Group 'A' position promotions under current circular instructions, but emphasized that the Complainant must be afforded a fair opportunity to contest this interpretation and present any counter-arguments or policy deviations. The Court emphasized that a strict timeline be followed to finalize submissions, wherein the Respondent shall immediately serve a copy of its written reply, originally dated 29.06.2026, to the Complainant by today itself. Following receipt of the response, the Complainant is granted a clear timeframe of 3 days to submit a formal remark to this Court, detailing any policy violations, amendments, or grounds on which he challenges the bank's promotional framework

4 . 2 The Respondent is advised to compile and submit Action Taken Report (ATR) to this Court within a strict timeframe of 21 days from the date of this order. The response must provide a detailed, point-wise clarification and reasoning addressing all the specific allegations raised by the Complainant, including the reasons for his exclusion from the Zone of Selection (ZOS), a comparative review of the performance metrics (CDS/PAF scores) and qualifications of the shortlisted candidates, and a certified reservation roster Register copy. It is made clear that if the Respondent fails to submit the required reply within the stipulated 21 days, the opportunity shall stand closed, and the case shall carry forward to be proceeded with on merits.

Digitally signed by
Ipsita Mitra
Date: 16-09-2026
18:16:25

(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities