



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  
 5<sup>th</sup> 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: 14507/1022/2023**

**In the matter of:**

**Complainant**

Shri Suresh Kumar

**Versus**

**Respondent(s)**

The Chairman and Managing Director, Punjab National Bank (md@pnb.co.in)

## 1. Hearing Details

1.1. A hearing was conducted in online mode on **27.04.2026**, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

| Sl. No. | Name of the Parties /<br>Representatives  | On Behalf of |
|---------|-------------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1.      | Shri Suresh Kumar                         | Complainant  |
| 2.      | Ms. Jessica, Assistant General<br>Manager | Respondent   |

## 2. RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

2.1 The Complainant, Shri Suresh Kumar, a person with above benchmark disability, filed a complaint on 27.08.2023, seeking a transfer from the Chaudhary Devi Lal University Branch to the Sirsa Shah Satnam Ji Nagar branch. He cited the need for a location that accommodates his disability and that of his spouse, who also suffers from a 70% disability. The Complainant argued for a transfer closer to

his residence, contesting the rotational transfer policy applied by the Respondent.

2.2 The Respondent defended the transfer as a procedural rotational move required after the completion of a five-year tenure, citing internal circular number 494 and CVC guidelines. They asserted that their transfer policy is compliant with the RPWD Act. Regarding accessibility, the Respondent claimed that the University Branch is equipped with ramps and other facilities compliant with Government of India guidelines, arguing that the Complainant does not require a wheelchair.

2.3 The Court observed that the Respondent's rigid application of rotational transfer policies is not in alignment with the spirit of the Section 34 of the RPwD Act, 2016, and advised the Bank to accommodate PWD employees closer to their residences whenever possible. Furthermore, the Court noted that the photographic evidence submitted by the Respondent regarding the branch's accessibility was insufficient and largely symbolic; specifically, the presence of a secondary mesh door acts as a physical barrier, rendering the facility inaccessible to wheelchair users. The Court recommended the Respondent to conduct a formal audit of the branch's accessibility conducts a formal accessibility audit performed exclusively by accessibility auditors empanelled by the Department of Empowerment of Persons with Disabilities (DepwD).

2.4. This audit shall evaluate both the safety of the commute path and the internal branch infrastructure against established accessibility standards and submit the findings within 30 days, from the date of receipt of this Order.

Digitally signed by  
Ipsita Mitra  
Date: 30-09-2026  
17:43:01

**(Ipsita Mitra)**

Deputy Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities