



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. 14496/1014/2023

In the matter of —

Shri Umesh Kumar

... Complainant

Versus

The Chief General Manager (In-Charge),
Human Resource Management Department,
Reserve Bank of India, Mumbai

... Respondent

1. Gist of the Complaint:

1.1 Shri Umesh Kumar, a person with 60% Hearing Impairment (Hard of Hearing), filed a complaint dated 15.09.2023, regarding not providing scribe facility to persons with hearing impairment.

1.2 The Complainant submitted that in the online application form in the advertisement published by the Reserve Bank of India in the year 2023, persons with hearing impairment were not provided the scribe facility even if they had Appendix A as mentioned in the Office Memorandum dated 29.08.2018 issued by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities, Ministry of Social Justice and Empowerment. The Complainant further submitted that the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its judgement - Vikas Kumar Vs UPSC has provided the facility of scribe to any person with a disability, even to the extent that the percentage of disability is less than 40%. That point was included in the online form, but unfortunately, due to some technical glitch or some failure to understand the form, the facility of a scribe was not provided when a person chooses the category B (Hearing Impaired) of Benchmark Disability.

1.3 The Complainant prayed to take necessary action so that he could apply in the online form.

2. Notice to Respondent for Reply:

A notice dated 22.09.2023 under sections 75 and 77 of the RPwD Act, 2016 was issued to the above-mentioned respondent for forwarding to this Court comments on affidavit for violation of section 3 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act [RPwD Act, 2016] and the DEPWD/MSJE OM No. 34-02/2015-DD-III dated 29.08.2018 and OM No. 29-6/2019-DD-II dated 10.08.2022 on the complaint within the statutory time limit.

3. Reply filed by the Respondent:

3.1 The respondent filed their reply dated 20.10.2023 and inter alia submitted that the Complainant applied for RBI Assistant - PY2023 and belongs to Persons with Benchmark Disability Category - Hearing Impaired. He submitted a Disability Certificate dated August 10, 2023, in support of his Hearing Impairment claim, wherein there is no mention of his arm being affected in the said certificate.

Further, he submitted another certificate dated 17.07.2023 issued by Dr Ram Manohar Lohiya Hospital, New Delhi, in respect of his claim regarding physical limitation to write. The said certificate dated 17.07.2023, states that the physical limitation to write is due to a forearm dislocation due to an accident. However, the certificate is not clear whether the nature of disability or difficulty in writing is permanent or temporary. Since the Disability Certificate dated 10.08.2023 was issued after the Certificate dated 17.07.2023 and does not mention his physical limitation to write, the complainant was not permitted to avail the facility of a scribe in the examination.

3.2 In view of the submissions made above, the Complainant was not entitled to any relief, as prayed for, or otherwise.

4. Rejoinder filed by the Complainant:

4.1 The Complainant, in his rejoinder dated 05.11.2023, submitted that the allegation that Annexure A, the "Certificate for physical limitation to write", was pre-dated than the certificate of disability, that generally a certificate for physical limitation to write is issued by the hospital with a validity for 3-months only, and the candidate has to get it updated frequently. Further, at the time of joining, all candidates have to undergo a medical check-up. So, this concern of the RBI would

have been suitably solved at that stage. Most importantly, RBI didn't find it appropriate to raise this issue earlier so that a new certificate could be obtained.

4.2 The Complainant reiterated his prayerto take necessary action so that he could apply in the online form.

5. Observations & Recommendations:

5.1 On the submissions made by both parties, the case was scheduled for hearing on 25.11.2025, and the notice of hearing was issued to the parties. In response, the Complainant vide e-mail dated 25.11.2025 informed that his complaint dated 15.09.2023 has been completely resolved, and requested to close the case.

5.2 Since the grievance of the Complainant stands redressed as submitted vide e-mail dated 25.11.2025, this Court is of the view that no further intervention is warranted in this matter.

6. Accordingly, the case is closed.

Digitally signed by
Ipsita Mitra
Date: 21-09-2026
17:40:51

(Ipsita Mitra)

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities