



न्यायालय मुख्य आयुक्त दिव्यांगजन

COURT OF 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, एनआई.एस.डी. भवन., जी2-, सेक्टर10-, द्वारका, नई दिल्ली 110075-; दूरभाष 20892364 (011) :
 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/14604/1040/2023

In the matter of:

Complainant:

Shri Deepanshu Bhardwaj

Respondent(s):

1. The Director, Indian Institute of Technology Madras
2. The Principal, Indraprastha Public School
3. The Principal, Titiksha Public School

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

1. **Hearing:** A hearing in the hybrid mode was conducted on 09.12.2025, wherein the following were present :

Sl. No.	Name & Designation of the Attendees (Smt./Shri)	On behalf of	Mode of Presence
1.	Prof. V. Kamakoti, Director, IIT (M)	Respondent No. 1	Online

2. Proceedings during the hearing:

2.1 At the outset, the Complainant could not be connected to the hearing despite attempts. Respondent No. 1, Indian Institute of Technology Madras (IIT Madras), was represented by Prof. Kamakoti, Director, IIT Madras.

2.2 Respondent No. 1 submitted that the matter relates to the NPTEL online

computer-based examinations conducted on 28 and 29 October 2023 through Tata Consultancy Services (TCS), with IIT Madras functioning as the National Coordinator.

2.3 With regard to the examination conducted at Indraprastha Public School, Rajasthan, Respondent No. 1 submitted that the Complainant's parents were not permitted to enter the examination hall in view of the security protocols applicable to the examination. However, a wheelchair was provided to the Complainant and volunteers assisted him in reaching the examination room.

2.4 With regard to the examination conducted at the other examination centre on 29 October 2023, Respondent No. 1 submitted that, during the examination, the Complainant requested a painkiller tablet. It was explained that, as per the applicable policy of TCS, oral medication could not be administered inside the examination hall and that only first-aid assistance was available. The Respondent further submitted that, in the event of a serious medical issue, a candidate could leave the examination and appear in a subsequent examination cycle, as the examination is conducted every month. However, the Complainant did not wish to leave the examination and also requested permission to meet his father during the examination, which was not permitted by the examination centre.

2.5 Respondent No. 1 further submitted that, upon receipt of the complaint, an investigation was undertaken and reports were obtained from the concerned examination centres. It was stated that an investigation report containing the relevant details had been prepared and was being placed before the Court.

2.6 The Respondent further submitted that, notwithstanding the issues raised in the complaint, the Complainant completed both examinations within the stipulated time and obtained good marks. It was also submitted that no contemporaneous complaint regarding the alleged incidents had been received by IIT Madras/NPTEL at the relevant time.

2.7 During the hearing, the Court enquired whether the reports received from the concerned examination centres had been formally placed on record. Respondent No. 1 confirmed that the investigation report had been prepared and submitted. It was explained that, although the response had been prepared earlier, the same could not be transmitted at that time due to a technical issue with the email server and was subsequently submitted.

2.8 The Court observed that the explanation furnished by Respondent No. 1 with regard to the allegations appeared relevant for consideration. However, the

investigation report and the material forming the basis thereof required examination before any final view could be taken in the matter.

2.9 The Court further observed that the Complainant could not be connected to the hearing and, consequently, his submissions could neither be considered nor clarified during the hearing. In the circumstances, the Court considered it appropriate to examine the material placed on record by the Respondent before proceeding further in the matter.

2.10 During the course of the hearing, Respondent No. 2, Indraprastha Public School, also joined the proceedings. However, by the time the Court sought to ascertain whether Respondent No. 2 had any further submissions to make, the said Respondent had left the hearing. The other examination centre, namely Titiksha Public School, was represented through Respondent No. 1.

2.11 Upon consideration of the submissions made during the hearing, the Court recommended Respondent No. 1, Indian Institute of Technology Madras (NPTEL), to place on record, within 7 days, the detailed investigation reports received from both examination centres, namely Indraprastha Public School and Titiksha Public School, along with any relevant call logs, incident records, statements of the concerned staff/officials, or other material relied upon in conducting the investigation.

2.12 A copy of the aforesaid documents shall also be furnished to the Complainant. The Complainant shall be at liberty to file a rejoinder, if any, within 7 days from the date of receipt of the said documents, specifically addressing the contents of the investigation reports and the policy/procedural submissions made by the Respondents.

**Digitally signed by
Ipsita Mitra
Date: 30-09-2026
18:24:09
(Ipsita Mitra)**

Dy. Chief Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities