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-AD-0110/2026

In the Matter of

Complainant

Shri Puneet Rawat

Versus

Respondent(s)

The Secretary, Ministry of Railways

1. Background of the Case

1.1 The Complainant, Shri Puneet Rawat, a person with 50% locomotor disability and a neurological condition, submitted a grievance dated 07.07.2026 and stated that on 31 March 2026, he travelled from Chandigarh to Panipat by Train No. 12058 with his wife and 9-year-old daughter (PNR No. 2615066842). He alleged that the IRCTC booking portal provided only the "Handicapped" and "Escort" ticket options, with no general ticket option. During the journey, railway staff questioned his daughter's ticket and asked him to purchase one for her. He further alleged that the TTE, Aman Tiwari, directed him to shift to another coach despite his disability, causing him hardship as he has difficulty walking and speaking due to his medical condition.

2. Hearing

2.1. A preliminary hearing was conducted on 07.08.2026 in hybrid mode, wherein the following parties/representatives were present:

Sl. No.	Name of the Parties / Representatives	On Behalf of
1.	Shri Puneet Rawat	Complainant

2.2 No representatives on behalf of the Respondent were present during the proceedings.

3. Record of Proceedings

3.1 During the proceedings, the Court sought clarification from the Complainant regarding the booking process and whether a valid ticket had been obtained for his daughter. The Complainant admitted that no separate ticket had been purchased for his daughter at the time of travel.

3.2 The Court observed that the IRCTC reservation system permits booking of tickets under the PwD concession category only for the eligible person with disability and the accompanying escort. Any additional accompanying passenger is required to obtain a separate general ticket through the regular booking process. Merely because the concession booking interface does not provide an option for booking a general ticket does not absolve a passenger of the obligation to obtain a valid ticket for every accompanying traveller.

3.3 In view of the above, the Court is of the considered opinion that the grievance relating to the railway authorities questioning the absence of a ticket for the Complainant's daughter cannot be sustained, as travelling without a valid ticket cannot be condoned or encouraged. Had a valid ticket been obtained, any issue relating to allotment of seats or adjustment of accommodation could have been addressed by the railway authorities in accordance with the applicable rules.

3.4 However, the allegation that the Complainant, despite being a person with benchmark disability, was directed by the TTE to shift to another coach, thereby causing avoidable hardship, raises concerns regarding the manner in which reasonable accommodation is extended to passengers with disabilities. Since no representative of the Respondent was present during the hearing to explain the circumstances or rebut the allegations, the Court considers it appropriate to seek the Respondent's explanation on this limited aspect.

3.5 Accordingly, the Respondent is recommended to file, within fifteen (15) days, a detailed report addressing the allegations regarding the conduct of the concerned TTE, the circumstances under which the Complainant was allegedly required to shift coaches, and the action, if any, taken in the matter. The Respondent shall also indicate the measures adopted to sensitise railway personnel regarding the rights of persons with disabilities and the obligation to provide reasonable accommodation during travel.

3.6 The Court notes that no relief can be provided to the Complainant in respect of the grievance arising out of the absence of a valid ticket for his daughter. Consequently, the Court has determined no further intervention necessary.

4. Accordingly, the case is disposed of.

Digitally signed by
S Govindaraj
Date: 09-10-2026
09:52:16

(S. Govindaraj)
Commissioner for Persons with Disabilities