



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-OF-0002/1111/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Ms. Falguni Maheshwari

Versus

Respondent(s)

1. The Chief Executive Officer and Managing Director, Air India Limited
2. The Secretary, Ministry of Civil Aviation
3. The Chief Executive Officer, Delhi International Airport Limited

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Ms. Falguni Maheshwari, a person with 80% locomotor disability (spastic triplegia) and a wheelchair user, submitted a grievance dated 07.06.2026 stating that she had travelled on Air India flight from Frankfurt to Delhi on 26.05.2026 without any medical hindrance or objection. It was noted that after boarding her connecting Air India flight from Delhi to Bhuj and occupying her seat (22C), cabin crew questioned her fitness to travel independently, demanded a "Fit to Fly" certificate, and de-boarded her without providing any written reasons or an evaluation by an airport doctor. The Complainant further contested that her powered wheelchair was returned in a damaged condition and that she was forced to arrange alternative flights and onward travel at her own expense and under severe emotional distress. She submitted that demanding medical clearance mid-boarding violated DGCA Civil Aviation Requirements (CAR) and sought full compensation, accountability, and systemic reforms.

2. Notice Issued to the Respondents

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Respondents vide notice dated

17.06.2026 citing provisions u/s 3 and 75 (1) (a), and (b) of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 read with Rule 8 of the RPwD Rules, 2017.

3. Respondent's Reply to the Notice

3.1 The Respondent No. 1, in reply dated 13.07.2026, contended that the complainant was not denied boarding but was offloaded solely on safety grounds after on-board observations allegedly indicated that she was immobile, unable to communicate verbally, and displaying medical concerns such as drooling. The airline maintained that, under its safety procedures, she required a competent escort and prior medical clearance, and therefore the decision to deplane her was a regulatory necessity rather than discrimination.

4. Rejoinder

4.1 In the rejoinder dated 20.07.2026, the Complainant rejected these assertions, arguing that Air India had violated the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and the DGCA Civil Aviation Requirements by demanding medical clearance only after boarding, refusing carriage without a medical examination or written reasons, and mishandling her wheelchair. She further relied on the Supreme Court's decision in *Jeeja Ghosh v. Union of India* to contend that the incident reflected systemic disability discrimination rather than an isolated operational lapse, and sought directions for compensation, disability sensitisation, and institutional reforms.

5. Hearing

5.1. A hearing was conducted on 27.07.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Ms. Falguni Maheshwari	Complainant
2.	Adv. Amar Jain	Complainant
3.	Adv. Sarah	Complainant
4.	Ms. Amla Halder, Legal Counsel	Respondent 1
5.	Mr. B.K. Singh, AD, DGCA	Respondent 2
6.	Ms. Somya Yadava, Manager (Litigation)	Respondent 3

6. Record of Proceedings

6.1 The learned counsel for the Complainant submitted that the Complainant is a person with 80% locomotor disability and a wheelchair user and had been travelling independently from Frankfurt to Delhi, following which she was scheduled to take a connecting Air India flight. He submitted that she was permitted to undertake the Frankfurt–Delhi journey without any requirement of a fit-to-fly certificate, but after boarding the connecting flight and taking her seat, she was asked to produce such a certificate. He contended that the requirement had neither been communicated to her at the time of booking nor at check-in or boarding. He further submitted that she was not examined by any medical officer of Air India before being de-boarded and that no proper medical basis or written reasons were provided to her for the decision. He contended that her disability-related characteristics, including her mobility and speech, appeared to have been treated as indicators of medical unfitness. He further submitted that her powered wheelchair was returned in a damaged condition, causing her additional hardship, and sought appropriate action, compensation and systemic measures to ensure that similar incidents do not recur.

6.2 During the proceedings, The Respondent No.1, Air India Limited, submitted that the Complainant had not been denied carriage merely on account of her disability, but that the decision was taken owing to concerns regarding her health and safety. It was submitted that the cabin crew observed that the Complainant appeared extremely tired and was suffering from cough and cold, which raised concerns regarding her ability to safely undertake the onward journey. The Respondent stated that, in such circumstances, medical clearance could be required in accordance with the applicable civil aviation requirements. It was further submitted that the Complainant subsequently obtained a fit-to-fly certificate and was accommodated on the next available Air India flight without additional fare. Air India also submitted that the wheelchair had been damaged during the course of handling and expressed its willingness to repair the wheelchair or compensate the Complainant for the damage.

6.3 The Court sought clarification from Air India regarding the specific medical basis for the decision to require the fit-to-fly certificate, particularly since the Complainant had already completed the preceding Frankfurt–Delhi journey. The Respondent was also asked whether any medical officer of Air India had examined or assessed the Complainant during the layover or before she was de-boarded, and regarding the credentials of the medical practitioner who ultimately issued the

fit-to-fly certificate. The Respondent stated that the certificate had been obtained by the Complainant herself and was unable to provide the details of the issuing medical practitioner during the hearing. It was also confirmed that no Air India medical officer had visited or medically assessed the Complainant during the layover.

6.4 The Respondent No. 3, Delhi International Airport Limited (DIAL), submitted that it had no role in the decision to de-board the Complainant or in requiring her to furnish a fit-to-fly certificate. It stated that its role was limited to airport operations, including passenger-handling and wheelchair assistance, and therefore the grievance concerning the decision to discontinue the Complainant's journey was primarily a matter concerning the airline.

6.5 The DGCA representative on behalf of Respondent No. 2 submitted that where an airline forms concerns regarding the medical fitness of a passenger, the applicable procedure contemplates appropriate medical consultation/assessment at the airport. The DGCA representative was accordingly asked to clarify the regulatory framework and the procedure required to be followed in such circumstances. Furthermore, The Court considered it necessary to obtain a detailed response from the DGCA regarding the applicable procedure for requiring medical/fit-to-fly certification, the safeguards governing such decisions, and the regulatory measures required to prevent recurrence of similar incidents. The matter was accordingly recommended to be examined further upon receipt of the DGCA's response.

7. Respondent's Further Submission

7.1 The learned representative of Respondent No. 3, Delhi International Airport Limited (DIAL), submitted vide email dated 14.08.2026 that no specific act, omission, negligence or discriminatory conduct had been attributed to DIAL in the complaint. It was submitted that the allegations concerning the requirement of a fit-to-fly certificate, the decision to de-board the Complainant, her interactions with airline personnel and the subsequent travel arrangements related to Air India and its personnel/ground-handling agency, did not fall within the responsibility or control of DIAL. DIAL further submitted that no complaint or representation regarding the incident had been made to it and that no DIAL employee was involved in the decision to de-board the Complainant.

7.2 It was further submitted that, under the applicable Civil Aviation Requirements (CAR), Section 3, Series M, Part I, the responsibility for assessing a passenger's medical fitness, requiring medical certification and taking a decision regarding boarding or offloading rests with the airline, whereas the obligations of

the airport operator primarily concern provision and maintenance of accessible airport infrastructure and facilities. DIAL stated that it facilitates accessibility measures and coordinates with airlines and ground-handling agencies for services such as wheelchair and Ambu-lift assistance, but that the primary responsibility for arranging such assistance rests with the concerned airline. With regard to the alleged damage to the Complainant's wheelchair, DIAL submitted that no specific act or omission attributable to DIAL had been identified. Accordingly, DIAL prayed that, in the absence of any cause of action against it, it be deleted from the array of parties and the complaint against it be dismissed.

7.3 The DGCA submitted in their reply vide letter dated 14.08.2026 that it has issued the Civil Aviation Requirements (CAR), Series M, Part-I, titled "*Carriage by Air of Persons with Disability and/or Persons with Reduced Mobility*", with the objective of safeguarding the interests of persons with disabilities while maintaining aircraft safety, and that the CAR was most recently revised as Revision 8 on 29.10.2025. It further submitted that the Ministry of Civil Aviation has issued *Accessibility Standards and Guidelines for Civil Aviation* for facilitating air travel for persons with disabilities and reduced mobility. DGCA stated that, pursuant to the hearing, the complaint was forwarded to the airline and the comments of Air India, including its response to the complaint lodged on the Air Sewa portal, were obtained and enclosed. It also clarified that DGCA is the statutory civil aviation safety regulator responsible for regulating various aspects of civil aviation under the applicable law.

7.4 DGCA further observed, upon examination of the complaint and the airline's comments, that Para 4.1.36 of the applicable CAR expressly provides that an airline shall not refuse carriage of a person on the basis of disability and/or reduced mobility; where the airline perceives that the passenger's health may deteriorate in flight, the passenger is required to be examined in person by a doctor, who must state the medical condition and whether the passenger is fit to fly, following which the airline may take an appropriate decision regarding carriage. The provision further requires that, where carriage is refused, the airline must immediately provide the passenger with the reasons for such refusal in writing. DGCA specifically observed that, in the present case, Air India failed to have the Complainant examined in person by a doctor at Delhi Airport on 26.05.2026 and also failed to provide her written reasons for the refusal of carriage.

8. Rejoinder II

8.1. The Complainant, in the rejoinder dated 17.09.2026, while reiterating her earlier submissions, prayed that the contentions raised by Respondent No. 1, Air

India Limited, be rejected and that the Respondent be held in violation of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 and the applicable CARs. She further sought directions for issuance of a written apology, payment of appropriate damages/compensation and reimbursement of expenses, including approximately ₹30,000/- towards repair/replacement of her damaged custom-modified electric wheelchair and ₹5,000/- towards emergency road travel expenses incurred for travel from Ahmedabad to Bhuj. She also sought ₹50,00,000/- as compensation for the alleged disability discrimination arising from her de-boarding, trauma, psychological distress, physical collapse and disruption of her academic plans. In addition, the Complainant prayed for appropriate systemic directions to Air India for revision of its policies, disability-sensitisation and staff training in accordance with CAR 4.3, standardisation of “Fit-to-Fly” procedures and submission of a compliance report; and to the Directorate General of Civil Aviation (DGCA) for formulation of comprehensive SOPs governing the handling and stowage of wheelchairs, public disclosure of airline and airport training materials and schedules as contemplated under CAR 4.4.2, ensuring digital accessibility of airline websites in accordance with CAR 4.4.1, and maintenance and periodic publication of grievance data concerning passengers with disabilities. The Complainant further prayed for such other orders as may be deemed appropriate in the circumstances of the case.

9. Legal Framework

9.1 The Court observes that accessibility, equality, non-discrimination, dignity and reasonable accommodation are not matters of concession or benevolence, but are statutory rights and binding obligations under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 (“RPwD Act”). The conduct of the Respondents is therefore required to be examined not merely from the perspective of ordinary airline procedures, but against the rights-based framework established under the RPwD Act and the applicable Civil Aviation Requirements (“CAR”) governing the carriage of persons with disabilities and persons with reduced mobility.

Section 3(1) of the RPwD Act — Equality, dignity and integrity

Section 3(1) of the RPwD Act recognises the right of persons with disabilities to equality, life with dignity and respect for their integrity equally with others. The provision requires that a passenger with disability be treated as an equal user of public transportation services and that the exercise of any regulatory or administrative power affecting such passenger must be consistent with dignity, autonomy and personal integrity. In the context of the present matter, any conduct by airline personnel which subjects a

passenger with disability to humiliating treatment, unnecessary scrutiny, differential treatment or denial of an otherwise available service is required to be assessed against this statutory guarantee of equality and dignity.

Section 3(3) of the RPwD Act — Prohibition of discrimination

Section 3(3) of the RPwD Act expressly prohibits discrimination against a person with disability on the ground of disability, unless the impugned act or omission is shown to be a proportionate means of achieving a legitimate aim. The statutory compliance is therefore not satisfied merely by demonstrating that the airline had a general safety concern or internal procedure. Where a person with disability is subjected to treatment different from that accorded to other passengers, the Respondents must be able to demonstrate a legitimate basis for such differential treatment and establish that the measure adopted was proportionate to the objective sought to be achieved.

Section 3(5) of the RPwD Act — Reasonable accommodation

Section 3(5) of the RPwD Act casts an obligation to take necessary and appropriate modifications and adjustments, without imposing a disproportionate or undue burden, to ensure that persons with disabilities enjoy or exercise their rights equally with others. The Court observes that reasonable accommodation is therefore required to be understood as an affirmative obligation and not as a discretionary facility which may be extended only when convenient to the service provider. In the context of air travel, such accommodation may include appropriate assistance during check-in, boarding, disembarkation and movement within the airport, as well as suitable treatment of assistive devices and mobility aids.

Section 40 of the RPwD Act — Accessibility standards

Section 40 of the RPwD Act provides for the formulation of rules laying down standards of accessibility for the physical environment, transportation, information and communications and other facilities and services provided to the public. The Court observes that the statutory recognition of accessibility in transportation demonstrates that accessibility is an integral component of equal participation and is not merely an infrastructural or administrative convenience. The standards framed pursuant to the Act consequently constitute an important part of the legal framework governing services provided to passengers with disabilities.

Section 41 of the RPwD Act — Access to transportation

Section 41 of the RPwD Act specifically requires the appropriate Government to take suitable measures to ensure accessibility for persons with disabilities in the modes of transport specified therein. The provision is of particular relevance to the present matter as air transportation constitutes an essential public service through which persons with disabilities are required to travel on an equal basis with other citizens. The obligation of accessibility therefore extends beyond the mere physical availability of an aircraft and encompasses the manner in which a passenger with disability is enabled to access, board, travel in and disembark from the aircraft.

Section 46 of the RPwD Act — Service providers

Section 46 of the RPwD Act requires service providers to comply with the accessibility requirements prescribed under the Act. Accordingly, an airline, while providing services to the public, is required to ensure compliance with the applicable accessibility standards and cannot rely upon internal practices or informal procedures which have the effect of defeating the statutory rights of persons with disabilities.

9.2 The statutory framework under the RPwD Act is supplemented by the Civil Aviation Requirements ("CAR") issued by the Directorate General of Civil Aviation ("DGCA") under Rule 133A of the Aircraft Rules, 1937, concerning the carriage of persons with disabilities and persons with reduced mobility. The applicable CAR prescribe specific safeguards concerning non-discrimination in carriage, medical clearance, assistance at airports and during boarding and disembarkation, treatment and transportation of wheelchairs and other assistive devices, and training and sensitisation of airline personnel.

Para 4.1.26:

"Airlines shall not insist on medical certificates or special forms from persons with disability (Divyangjan) or reduced mobility who wish to travel without an escort and only require special assistance at an airport for embarking / disembarking and reasonable accommodation in flight."

Para 4.1.36

"Airlines shall not refuse carriage of any person on the basis of disability and/or reduced mobility. However, in case, an airline perceives that the health of such a passenger may deteriorate in-flight, the said passenger will have to be examined by a Doctor in person - who shall in his/her opinion, categorically state the medical condition and whether the passenger is fit to fly or not. After obtaining the medical opinion, the airline shall take an

appropriate decision on the carriage of such passengers. In case of refusal of carriage by the airline, it shall inform the passenger in writing with the reasons therein immediately."

It is pertinent to note here that Air India provided no in-person examination to the Complainant. The Respondent No. 1 de-boarded the Complainant based solely on the visual, untrained observations of the crew and PIC. No medical professional or airport doctor was brought on board to examine her. The Complainant was ordered off the plane without any contemporaneous written notice or statement of reasons, which is a direct violation of this mandatory protocol. Para 4.1.36 was specifically strengthened following the 2022 Indigo Ranchi incident (where a child with special needs was denied boarding) to eliminate arbitrary offloading based on staff discomfort or prejudice.

Para 4.4.8

"Where wheelchairs or other mobility equipment or assistive devices are lost or damaged whilst being handled at the airport or transported on board aircraft, the passenger to whom the equipment belongs shall be compensated by the airline/airport operator/GHA/organisation responsible for such loss or damage."

9.3 The statutory and regulatory framework is required to be read in light of the authoritative principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jeeja Ghosh & Anr. v. Union of India & Ors.*, (2016) 7 SCC 761. The said case concerned a passenger with cerebral palsy who was de-boarded by an airline after she had boarded the aircraft. The Hon'ble Supreme Court found the decision to de-board her, in the circumstances of that case, to be uncalled for and observed that the manner in which she was treated demonstrated a "total lack of sensitivity" on the part of the airline officials.

9.4 The principle emerging from *Jeeja Ghosh* is that the right of a passenger with disability to access air transportation cannot be separated from the right to be treated with dignity, sensitivity and respect. The Court observes that compliance with technical procedures by an airline cannot, by itself, justify conduct which humiliates, degrades or disproportionately burdens a passenger with disability. The manner in which a statutory or regulatory power is exercised is itself relevant when determining whether the rights of the passenger have been respected.

9.5 In *Jeeja Ghosh*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court awarded compensation of ₹10,00,000/- to the affected passenger, recognising the humiliation, mental trauma

and violation of dignity resulting from the conduct of the airline. The judgment is therefore significant not merely for determining the legality of the de-boarding in that case but also for recognising that discriminatory and degrading treatment of a passenger with disability may warrant an appropriate monetary remedy.

9.6 In the present matter, the conduct of the Respondent 1 is therefore required to be examined against the aforesaid statutory, regulatory and judicial safeguards. The Respondents are required to demonstrate that the action complained of was founded upon an objectively ascertainable and legally permissible basis, was proportionate to any legitimate aim sought to be achieved, and was undertaken after duly considering the Complainant's right to reasonable accommodation, accessibility, dignity and non-discrimination.

10. Observation and Recommendations

10.1 The Court, having considered the facts and circumstances of the present matter, the rights guaranteed under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016 ("RPwD Act"), the applicable Civil Aviation Requirements ("CAR") issued by the Directorate General of Civil Aviation ("DGCA"), and the principles laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jeeja Ghosh & Anr. v. Union of India & Ors.*, (2016) 7 SCC 761, is of the considered view that the grievance of the Complainant warrants appropriate, effective, and consequential remedial action.

10.2 Section 75(1)(b) of the RPwD Act empowers this Court to inquire into deprivation of rights of persons with disabilities and to take up such matters with the appropriate authorities for corrective action. Section 75(1)(d) further enables the Court to examine systemic factors inhibiting the enjoyment of such rights and to recommend suitable remedial measures.

10.3 Section 76 of the RPwD Act mandates that where recommendations are made, the concerned authority shall take necessary action and report compliance within the prescribed period. In case of non-acceptance, reasons are required to be communicated to the Court as well as to the aggrieved person.

10.4 In the present case, the Complainant, despite having boarded the aircraft, was prevented from continuing her journey and was compelled to make alternative arrangements to reach Bhuj. The resulting expenditure, including travel by cab from Ahmedabad to Bhuj, was neither voluntary nor incidental but arose directly from the denial of continuation of air travel.

10.5 The Court further notes that the Complainant had already incurred the airfare and had been permitted to board the flight. The subsequent disruption rendered such expenditure ineffective and imposed an additional financial burden.

These consequential costs cannot, in the circumstances, be treated as ordinary travel expenses. The Court also takes serious note of the damage caused to the Complainant's wheelchair, which is an essential assistive device integral to her mobility, independence, and dignity. Such damage cannot be equated with ordinary baggage loss, as it directly impairs the autonomy and safety of a person with disability.

10.6 The Court further notes that the Complainant had specifically stated in her complaint that her powered wheelchair was damaged while she was being de-boarded from the aircraft. The allegation therefore concerns the handling of an essential mobility aid at the airport during the process of disembarkation and cannot be treated as wholly unrelated to the responsibilities of the airport-side service providers. While Respondent No. 3 has stated that it had no role in the decision to de-board the Complainant, the issue of damage to the wheelchair is a distinct aspect of the grievance and requires examination with reference to the entity or personnel who had custody of and handled the wheelchair at the relevant stage.

10.7 In this regard, Para 4.4.8 of the applicable CAR specifically contemplates compensation where a wheelchair or other mobility equipment is lost or damaged while being handled at the airport or transported on board an aircraft, and identifies the airline, airport operator, Ground Handling Agency (GHA), or other organisation responsible for such loss or damage. Accordingly, the fact that Respondent No. 3 was not involved in the decision to require medical clearance or deboard the Complainant does not, by itself, conclusively absolve it from consideration in relation to the alleged damage to the wheelchair. The relevant question is which entity or personnel were responsible for handling the Complainant's wheelchair at the time when the alleged damage occurred.

10.8 The Court further takes into consideration the mental harassment, humiliation, inconvenience and distress suffered by the Complainant as a consequence of the incident. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Jeeja Ghosh* recognised that the discriminatory and insensitive treatment of a passenger with disability may cause humiliation, mental trauma and violation of dignity warranting monetary compensation. The Court therefore considers that the remedial relief in the present matter ought not to be confined merely to reimbursement of a particular item of expenditure but should take into account the cumulative financial and non-pecuniary hardship suffered by the Complainant.

10.9 The Court further takes note of the fact that the present incident assumes greater significance in view of an earlier adjudication concerning denial of boarding

by Tata SIA Airlines Limited (Vistara), an airline forming part of the Tata Group, wherein the District Consumer Disputes Redressal Commission, Raipur, awarded compensation of ₹1,00,000/- to the affected passenger for the physical, mental and financial hardship occasioned by the denial of boarding despite a confirmed ticket. Vistara subsequently merged with Air India, with Air India being the surviving entity. The present matter therefore reflects a recurrence of serious concerns relating to the treatment of passengers and the denial/discontinuation of carriage within the same corporate aviation structure, notwithstanding the existence of established statutory and regulatory safeguards.

- a. The Court further observes that the present case is materially more serious inasmuch as the Complainant is a person with 80% locomotor disability and a wheelchair user, and the decision to discontinue her journey was taken after she had already boarded the aircraft, without the mandatory in-person medical examination contemplated under Para 4.1.36 of the applicable CAR and without contemporaneous written reasons for refusal of carriage. The safeguards governing carriage of persons with disabilities are intended precisely to prevent arbitrary or perception-based decisions of this nature.
- b. Having regard to the aforesaid antecedent, the subsequent merger of Vistara with Air India, the repeated nature of concerns relating to denial of carriage, the statutory safeguards under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and the mandatory procedure prescribed under the applicable CAR, the Court considers that a mere direction for corrective action would not adequately serve the ends of deterrence and institutional accountability. Accordingly, in exercise of the power under Section 89 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, Respondent No. 1, Air India Limited, is hereby levied a fine of ₹50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand only) for the contravention of the statutory and regulatory safeguards governing the rights of persons with disabilities in air transportation.
- c. Accordingly, Respondent No. 1, Air India Limited, is hereby recommended to pay ₹5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakh only) to the Complainant by way of compensation for the mental agony, humiliation, distress and inconvenience suffered by her as a consequence of the discontinuation of her journey after she had already boarded the aircraft, as well as the consequential financial hardship caused to her. The said amount shall also take into account the cost incurred towards repair/restoration of the Complainant's wheelchair and the expenses incurred towards travel necessitated by the discontinuation of her journey, without prejudice to any other specific reliefs directed herein. The Court considers such compensation necessary for vindication of the

Complainant's rights and for recognising the aggravated impact of the incident upon a person with benchmark disability who is dependent upon a wheelchair for mobility.

- d. The award of such compensation, together with the penal deposit, constitutes a public law remedy, intended not merely for reimbursement but for vindication of rights, deterrence of future violations, and enforcement of statutory obligations.

10.10 The aforesaid compensation shall be without prejudice to any independent entitlement of the Complainant under the applicable CAR or any other law in respect of repair, replacement, or compensation for the damaged wheelchair or assistive equipment. Respondent No. 1 shall separately assess the damage and take appropriate remedial action in accordance with the applicable framework.

10.11 The Court further recommends that Respondent No. 1 undertake a detailed internal examination of the circumstances leading to the Complainant's de-boarding, including: the basis of the decision, the circumstances in which medical clearance was demanded, the role and conduct of personnel involved, and compliance with prescribed procedures. The outcome of such examination shall be placed on record with supporting material.

10.12 The Respondent No. 1 is further recommended to ensure that its personnel are adequately sensitised and trained in rights of persons with disabilities, reasonable accommodation, non-discrimination, medical clearance protocols, and handling of assistive devices so as to prevent recurrence of similar incidents.

10.13 The Respondent No. 1 shall submit an **Action Taken Report (ATR)** within **60 days** from the date of receipt of this Order, detailing payment of compensation deposit to the National Fund as well as the Complainant, action taken regarding the damaged wheelchair, and findings of the internal examination.

10.14 The Court emphasises that the object of the present recommendations extends beyond redressal of an individual grievance. It is intended to address the cumulative financial hardship, disruption, humiliation, and loss of dignity suffered by the Complainant, and to ensure systemic adherence to the principles of equality, dignity, non-discrimination, and reasonable accommodation mandated under the RPwD Act and the applicable CAR. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

11. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 24-09-2026
11:52:46

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities