



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

Notice u/s 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016

Case No: CCPD-OF-0023/1041/2026

To,

The Chairman, National Testing Agency (NTA), ND

Email: chairman@nta.ac.in

...Respondent No. 1

Head iON Digital Zone, Lucknow

Email: ion.communication@tcs.com

...Respondent No. 2

Sub: Notice to file comments in the complaint dated 02.06.2026 of Mr. Shiva Royal, a person with 60% Low vision, regarding the non-provision of appropriate reasonable accommodation, specifically the failure to provide a competent and timely scribe by the National Testing Agency (NTA) for the CUET (UG) 2026 examination in the subjects of English, Accountancy, and Business Studies, resulting in an inability to effectively attempt the examination.

Madam /Sir,

I am directed to enclose a copy of documents related to the complaint dated **02.06.2026** of **Mr. Shiva Royal**, a person with **60% Low Vision**, on the above-mentioned subject, which is self-explanatory.

2. Whereas a preliminary hearing was conducted in Case No. CCPD-AD-

0015/2026 on 18.06.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

S.NO	NAME /DESIGNATION OF THE PARTY	REPRESENTATIVE OF
1	Mr. Shiva Royal	Complainant
2	Shri Sandeep, Deputy Director	Respondent 1
3	Smt. Sanjeeta Bharadwaj, Consultant	Respondent 1

2 . 1 During the proceedings, the Complainant, a candidate with a disability, reiterated his grievance regarding the Common University Entrance Test Undergraduate (CUET UG) examination held on May 29, 2026, at the designated centre in Lucknow. He stated that the scribe provided to him by the examination centre was not competent and was unable to properly read English sentences on the test module. He submitted that, after attempting only three questions, he reported this issue to the invigilator at around 3:30 PM. However, the invigilator only asked him to remain seated and did not provide a replacement scribe or make any other arrangement. As a result, the Complainant was unable to attempt the remaining questions and had to submit an incomplete answer sheet. Respondent No. 1 (NTA) submitted that the scribe was introduced to the Complainant at 1:45 PM for the second shift examination, which was scheduled to begin at 3:00 PM. It was contended that, since the Complainant had been with the scribe for more than an hour before the examination, he should have raised the issue regarding the scribe's language ability before the examination commenced. Respondent No. 2 did not appear through any separate representative.

2 . 2 And whereas, upon considering the matter, the Hon'ble Commissioner expressed serious concern regarding the National Testing Agency's failure to follow the applicable legal requirements, particularly the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DEPwD) Office Memorandum of 2018, which requires that a scribe provided by the examination authority be introduced to the candidate at least two days before the examination. The Hon'ble Commissioner observed that introducing such an important examination accommodation only about an hour before a major national entrance examination does not provide the candidate with sufficient time to assess the suitability of the scribe and places an undue psychological burden on the candidate. Accordingly, the Hon'ble Commissioner decided to register the case and recommended that Respondent No. 1 immediately examine the possibility of conducting a special re-examination

for the Complainant. Respondent No. 1 was also directed to submit a comprehensive Action Taken Report (ATR) and a detailed written explanation by way of an affidavit before this Court within fifteen (15) days from the date of the hearing.

3. And whereas Section 3 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, hereinafter referred to as “the Act”, provides as under:

“3. (1) The appropriate Government shall ensure that the persons with disabilities enjoy the right to equality, life with dignity and respect for his or her integrity equally with others.

(2) The appropriate Government shall take steps to utilise the capacity of persons with disabilities by providing appropriate environment.

(3) No person with disability shall be discriminated on the ground of disability, unless it is shown that the impugned act or omission is a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim.

(4) No person shall be deprived of his or her personal liberty only on the ground of disability.

(5) The appropriate Government shall take necessary steps to ensure reasonable accommodation for persons with disabilities.”

4. And whereas Section 75 (1) (a) and (b) of the Act mandates the Chief Commissioner to identify, suo motu or otherwise, the provisions of any law or policy, programme and procedures, which are inconsistent with the Act and recommend necessary corrective steps and to look into complaints inter-alia, concerning matters relating to deprivation of rights of persons with disabilities either on his own motion or on the application of any aggrieved person or otherwise.

5. And Respondents are advised to confirm the receipts of this Notice for Comments and Hearing by return email and submit their comments and the requisite information/documents **positively within fifteen (15) days from the date of the preliminary hearing** signed by an officer of an appropriate seniority not below the level of Group ‘A’ officer and to produce all the requisite documents upon which you base your Comments or Claim and where you rely on any other document as evidence in support of your comments or claim, you shall enter such documents in a list to be annexed to the Comments on Complaint along with action taken in compliance with statutory provisions as mentioned at paras 3 above, failing which, the complaint may be disposed of ex-parte. While responding to this notice

due care may be taken of relevant provisions of the Act, other statutory provisions, and government instruction such as the ones mentioned above including but not limited to sections 4, 16 and 17 of the Act and Para-IV and Para 1 (IV & XII) of the 'Guidelines for conducting written examination for Persons with Benchmark Disabilities' issued by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (Divyangjan), Ministry of Social Justice & Empowerment vide Office Memorandum No. 34-02/2015-DD-III dated 29.08.2018 read with Corrigendum dated 08.02.2019 and Office Memorandum No. 29-6/2019-DD-III dated 10.08.2022 issued by DEPWD/MSJE.

6. The Respondents shall also serve a copy of their reply/comment to the Complainant **via email and the proof of service be submitted to this Court along with the reply/comment.** The Respondent may also provide additional inputs relevant to the case, if desired. However, it is to be informed that in case any statutory provision, any judgment of a High Court or the Supreme Court, rules formulated under any statute, Office Memorandum, or bye-law is relied upon, the Respondent shall attach a copy of the same along with your comments on the Complaint. **The Complainant may file his rejoinder, if any, to this Court positively on or before the date of hearing with a copy to the Respondent(s).**

Digitally signed by
Vikas Trivedi
Date: 17-09-2026
14:48:45

(Vikas Trivedi)

Dy. Chief Commissioner

Copy To:
Mr. Shiva Royal