



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: 14298/1023/2023

In the matter of:

Complainant

Shri Manish Singh

Versus

Respondent(s)

Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, Lucknow

1. Gist of the Complaint

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Manish Singh, a person with a 40% benchmark locomotor disability, challenged the actions of the Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (BBAU) authorities and the Sanitation In-charge regarding workplace discrimination, severe mental harassment, and arbitrary termination from his services. Having served as a Sanitation Supervisor at the university for approximately 5 years, he alleged that upon the appointment of Dr. Ravi Shankar Verma as the new Sanitation In-charge, the administrative environment became highly hostile. The Complainant submitted that despite his consistent and dedicated service, he was systematically targeted, his entry into the campus was banned, and his livelihood was stripped away, causing him extreme financial distress and severe mental agony.

1.2 The Complainant alleged that instead of being provided an inclusive and accessible working environment, he was subjected to explicit, abusive, and humiliating remarks regarding his physical impairment by the Sanitation In-charge. Dr. Ravi Shankar Verma allegedly targeted his functional capacity by publicly stating that individuals with disabilities ("lucche-langde") were not required in the department, explicitly using his disability as a pretext to clear the post for personal

associates. The Complainant further raised a broader systemic grievance regarding financial exploitation, detailing an ongoing ESIC contribution fraud and arbitrary salary deductions affecting 53 outsourced sanitation workers at the institution. Despite making multiple written representations and reminders to the Vice-Chancellor, Registrar, and local police authorities to register an FIR, no institutional redressal was provided, directly violating the statutory rights and protections enshrined under the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016.

2. Notice Issued:

2.1 The matter was taken up with the Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (BBAU), Lucknow, vide an official notice dated 26.07.2023. The notice referenced the court's powers under Sections 75 & 77 of the Rights of Persons with Disabilities Act, 2016, and directed the establishment to file formal comments on affidavit along with relevant action-taken reports regarding equality and institutional grievance systems.

3. Respondent's Reply to the Notice

3.1 The Registrar, Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University, in the response dated 26.08.2023, stated that the Complainant was not an institutional employee directly appointed by BBAU but was instead engaged through an independent third-party outsourcing agency. The university maintained that it played absolutely no administrative role in the termination or modification of his services, shifting the entire employment liability onto the external agency.

3.2 The respondent further submitted that the Complainant's performance, work ethics, and behavioural conduct had been consistently unsatisfactory and insubordinate toward his administrative superiors. BBAU categorically denied all allegations of personal bias or active discrimination, asserting its robust commitment to central welfare policies. To demonstrate compliance with Sections 21 and 23 of the RPwD Act, the university attached historical office orders from 2021, 2022, and 2023, confirming the formal constitution of an institutional PwD Grievance Committee, an Advisory Committee, and the nomination of an internal PwD Nodal Officer.

4. Rejoinder

4.1 The Complainant filed his formal rejoinder on 12.09.2023, vehemently refuting the university's written statement and asserting that his termination was driven entirely by the personal interests and nepotistic motives of the Sanitation In-charge, Dr. Ravi Shankar Verma. He stated that his employment was cut short exclusively to accommodate the supervisor's relatives for domestic work, using his

disability as a tool for public humiliation.

4.2 He expressed deep concern over the university's attempt to completely distance itself from the case, highlighting that the institution acted as an active accomplice by blocking his physical access and placing an entry ban on him the moment he sought legal help. The Complainant challenged the truthfulness of BBAU's statement, calling their affidavit completely fabricated, and requested the Court to conduct a comprehensive judicial inquiry into his termination, weaponized campus bans, and the underlying financial exploitation of disabled workers.

5. Hearing

5.1. A hearing was conducted on 27.11.2025 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Manish Singh	Complainant
2.	Dr. R.S. Verma, In-charge (Sanitation), BBAU, Lucknow	Respondent
3.	Shri Rajan Mishra, Legal Counsel, BBAU, Lucknow	Respondent

6. Record of Proceedings

6.1 The Complainant submitted that he had been performing duties in the sanitation wing of the University and alleged that he was subjected to harassment and inappropriate behaviour by the sanitation team, particularly by Shri Hari Shankar Verma. He stated that his duties were withdrawn and that he had not been permitted to work since October 2023 without any valid reason. He further submitted that he had approached various authorities, including the Ministry and labour authorities, and requested appropriate intervention regarding his employment and the alleged discriminatory treatment.

6.2 Dr. R.S. Verma, In-charge (Sanitation), appearing on behalf of the Respondent University, disputed the maintainability of the complaint against the University. He submitted that Babasaheb Bhimrao Ambedkar University (BBAU) is a Central University and that sanitation services are provided through an outsourced arrangement. He stated that the Complainant was not directly appointed by the University and that the sanitation work was being performed through an external

manpower agency.

6.3 The Respondent further submitted that the Complainant was deployed at the University by the outsourcing agency and that issues arose during his deployment. It was also submitted that the Complainant had earlier approached the State Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities with a similar grievance, which was closed in 2023. The Respondent maintained that there was no direct employer-employee relationship between the University and the Complainant.

6.4 During the proceedings, the Complainant was directed to furnish documentary evidence and relevant recordings in support of his allegations of harassment and disability-based discrimination within 7 days from the date of hearing.

7. Complainant's and Respondent's Further Submission

7.1 The Complainant alleged that he was subjected to harassment and discrimination on account of his disability by Dr. Ravi Shankar Verma, In-charge (Sanitation). He alleged that derogatory remarks were made regarding his disability and that his salary and EPF/ESIC benefits were stopped. He further alleged that he was removed from duty and subsequently restricted from entering the University premises. He stated that he had approached various authorities seeking redressal of his grievances.

7.2. The Respondent University and the outsourcing agency, M/s J-Sharp Technology, disputed these allegations. The University stated that the Complainant was engaged through the external agency and that matters relating to his deployment and engagement were within the agency's purview. The agency, in its submission, stated that there was no formal termination order and that payment of salary was affected due to non-inclusion of the Complainant's name in the attendance records furnished by the University.

8. Observation and Recommendation

8.1 The Court has considered the submissions of the parties and the material placed on record. Allegations of disability-based discrimination or harassment under the RPwD Act, 2016 require supporting material sufficient to establish a prima facie violation of the rights protected under the Act. In the present case, the Complainant has relied upon written submissions and audio recordings in support of his allegations. However, the material placed on record, including the audio recordings, does not sufficiently establish, in the present proceedings, that the alleged conduct was on account of the Complainant's disability or that the

University deliberately discriminated against him on the ground of disability.

8.2 As regards the Complainant's employment, the material on record indicates that he was engaged through an outsourcing agency, M/s J-Sharp Technology, and not directly appointed by the University. The issues relating to his deployment, attendance and payment of wages therefore involve the contractual arrangement between the outsourcing agency and the Complainant. On the material presently available, no specific act of the University has been established which would constitute discrimination on the ground of disability under the RPwD Act, 2016.

8.3 With regard to the allegation concerning restriction of entry into the University premises, the Respondent has stated that the entry arrangements were part of the general security and campus protocols. In the absence of material establishing that such restriction was specifically imposed on the Complainant on account of his disability or with the intention of preventing him from pursuing his grievance, no violation of the RPwD Act can be conclusively established on this issue.

8.4 In view of the above, no specific violation of the provisions of the RPwD Act, 2016 has been established against the Respondent University on the basis of the material presently available. The grievances relating to employment, wages, EPF/ESIC and contractual disengagement, insofar as they arise from the Complainant's engagement through the outsourcing agency, may be pursued by him before the appropriate forum against the concerned agency, in accordance with law.

8.5 Accordingly, no further intervention by this Court is considered necessary. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 05-10-2026
11:00:00

(S. Govindaraj)

Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities